

The Classical Review

OCTOBER 1896.

ON THE TOGA PRAETEXTA OF ROMAN CHILDREN.

I HAVE searched in vain in handbooks, dictionaries, and other learned works, for any real explanation of the familiar but always interesting fact that Roman children had the privilege of wearing the *toga praetexta*,—boys until the age of puberty, girls until their marriage. It seems hardly enough to say that this form of toga was the mark of freeborn children, and was derived from Etruscan usage. I feel sure that there was originally some further meaning in the practice, and I make the following suggestions with the object of pointing out at least in what direction we may look for such a meaning.

We must first compare the various uses of the *toga praetexta*, and of other garments of a similar nature. In civil life the purple-bordered toga was worn only by *curule* magistrates, *i.e.* by those who were directly descended from the rex in state law; non-curule magistrates were strictly forbidden the use of it. Mommsen (*Staatsrecht*, i. 402 foll.) would seem to correlate this part of the magisterial insignia with the right of having lictors and fasces, and so to explain its extension to the magistrates of municipia; but the censors form an awkward exception to this rule, for they had the *toga praetexta* without the lictors and fasces. I should rather guess that the true correlation is between this toga and the right of performing public sacrifices on behalf of the state which belonged to curules only. It is a curious fact that even the *magistri collegiorum* wore it when engaged in religious duties, *i.e.* at the *Ludi Compita-*

licii, a very ancient worship (Cic. in *Pisonem* 3, 9, and Asconius *ad loc.*).

Next we note that all the priests of the most ancient state priesthoods wore the *toga praetexta*; a fact which seems to me strongly to confirm the conjecture that its use by magistrates had originally a religious signification. About the dress of the Rex sacrorum we do not seem to be informed; but the Flamen Dialis wore the *praetexta* always (Serv. *Aen.* viii. 552) and the other flamines, as well as the members of the four great priestly colleges, when they were performing religious functions, and *more especially at sacrifices* (Serv. *l.c.*, Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, i. 406). The *Fratres Arvales* wore it on the first two days of their great festival, and laid it aside on the third after the conclusion of the sacrificial part of their duties. It may be noted also that in the ceremony of *devotio* the victim, himself also the priest, puts on the *toga praetexta* for the sacrifice.¹ The Vestal Virgins did not wear the toga; but here again the connexion of the purple stripe with sacrifice is noticeable, for the *suffibulum* which they wore on their heads when sacrificing was white with a purple border (Festus 349). The *Salii* wore a trabea instead of a toga: this also was purple-bordered as far as we can guess from

¹ Liv. viii. 9 'Agedum (says Decius) pontifex publicus populi Romani, praei verba quibus me pro legionibus deprecem'. Pontifex cum togam praetextam sumere iussit, et velato capite, manu subter togam ad mentum exserta, super telum subiectum pedibus stantem sic dicere, &c.; Liv. x. 28 (of the younger Decius). Devotus inde eadem precatione eodemque habitu quo pater se iusserat devoveri

the authorities (Serv. *Aen.* vii. 612, Isid. *Orig.* xix. 24, 8), and the body of it was of a bright red.

On the whole then we seem to learn that the *praetexta* was what may be called a holy garment, worn by priests especially during sacrificial rites, and by magistrates who had the right of sacrificing on behalf of the state. If this be so, we are naturally inclined to look in the same direction for the meaning of the *praetexta* as worn by children. Now nothing is better attested in Roman ritual than the constant use of children as acolytes, especially at sacrifices: I need only refer to Marquardt, *Staatsverfassung* iii. 220 foll. and the references there given, to Henzen, *Acta Fratr. Arv.* p. 42, and to Schreiber's *Atlas of Classical Antiquities* (Prof. Anderson's edition), Plates XVII. and XIX. The *Carmen saeculare* of Horace has made us all familiar with the practice, and the recently found inscription containing the ritual of the *ludi* entirely bears out Horace (see line 147, for the twenty-seven boys and twenty-seven girls who sang the *carmen*). This usage must go back into remote antiquity, for it was the very oldest priests, the *flamines*, who had acolytes (*camilli* and *camillae*) specially attached to them: and the strict regulation that the children must be *patrimi* and *matrimi* i.e., have both parents living, points also to an ancient form of superstition which is genuinely Italian though not unknown in Greece. These children must be *investes* (Serv. *Aen.* xi. 443), i.e. they have not yet gone out into the world, either by assumption of the ordinary everyday dress of business, or by marriage. They were in fact holy, and they wore continually the holy garment which their fathers only assumed when authorized by office to perform religious rites. The grown men, in other words, were mixing in the world, and always liable to some contamination: the children, like their elders under certain religious circumstances, were pure and so designated by their dress. (On this point compare Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 434.) There had certainly been a time, when all children of *ingenui* served at family *sacra*¹ attending on the father

¹ This is in fact attested by a passage in Columella (*R.R.* 12, 4), drawn as he asserts from older writers: 'ne contractentur pocula nec cibi nisi ab impube aut certe abstinentissimo a rebus venereis, quibus si fuerit operatus vel vir vel femina debere eos flumine aut perenni aqua priusquam penora contingant ablui. Propter quod his necessarium esse pueri vel virginis ministerium, per quos promantur quae usus postulerit.' The *penus*, be it remembered, was a holy

who performed the rite: as the religion of the state outgrew that of the household, the idea of holiness and the corresponding dress survives in the state only for priests and magistrates of what I may call priestly descent, and capable of priestly functions. But it is retained also for children, not only because of the constant demand for them as ministrants, but because of their being in reality 'unspotted from the world,'—an ethical idea here gradually superimposing itself upon the original purely ceremonial conception of holiness. And as the distinction began to assert itself in the growing state between *ingenui* and non-*ingenui*, the *praetexta* also came to have the significance which is commonly attached to it,—it became a sign of free birth.

But although these two later ideas of ethical purity and free birth get the better of the older religious meaning of the children's toga, there are passages even in later Latin literature which go far to convince me that the true significance was never wholly lost to the conservative Roman mind. The *praetexta* never became a mere badge of youth, like an English boy's jacket: it always retained the ideas of sanctity and distinction. Pliny in speaking of it says that it was 'pro majestate pueritiae' (*N.H.* ix. 127). Quintilian (*Decl.* 340) wrote of it as 'illud sacrum praetextarum, quo infirmitatem pueritiae sacram facimus et venerabilem.' Cp. Macrobius *Sat.* i. 6. Or again (of all *praetextati*) 'Praetextatis nefas erat obscaeno verbo uti, ideoque praetextatum appellabant sermonem, qui nihil obscaenitatis haberet' (*Festus*, p. 245), where the word *obscaenum* may be partly literal, i.e. ill-omened, and partly ethical, i.e. impure. I may also quote Persius v. 30, 'Cum primum pavido custos mihi purpura cessit,' for the sanctity conferred on its wearer by the *praetexta*,—an ethical idea easily developed out of the older religious one. The piteous cry of the boy in Horace's *Epode* will also occur to the reader, 'Per hoc inane purpurae decus precor,' and in Juvenal's famous 'Maxima debetur puero reverentia,' the same idea is inherent, though the dress is not mentioned. I think in fact that we have here an interesting example of the evolution of an ethical idea, as well as of a civil distinction, from a religious conception and practice of very great antiquity. My argument may prove to be defective, but I

place, and for access to it bodily holiness was thought necessary. This could be acquired by an adult only by the 'fiction' of washing.

venture it as giving the only explanation I know of this singular Roman usage.

In order to keep this note as short as possible, I have purposely said nothing of the bulla, which was associated with the *praetexta* in the dress of children, and also in certain other cases such as that of the triumphator. The bulla was certainly an amulet used to avert evil influences; and this might suggest a similar origin for the *praetexta*. But I cannot find good proof of this, unless it be in the passage of Festus quoted above; and on the whole I am at present disposed to think that the two are not derivable from exactly the same religious

germ. Nor have I said anything of the alleged Etruscan origin of these insignia; for though it may well be that the form they eventually took was Etruscan, it seems to me probable that, as in religious matters generally, what was borrowed was no more than a new and improved method of ornamentation, engrafted on an original Roman practice. The use of the purple dye, for example, may have come to Rome through Etruria, but it does not follow that the Romans themselves had not some more primitive means of expressing the holiness of their garments.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

THE MSS. OF THE FIRST EIGHT PLAYS OF PLAUTUS.

AMONG the MSS. which contain only the first eight plays of Plautus the British Museum codex (*J*) held for some time a leading place in the estimation of editors, until a closer examination showed that its few superior readings were outweighed by a large number of perversions of the text. MSS. which offer this puzzling combination of good and bad points are as a rule copies either of a text into which some readings had been introduced from a good MS. or of a 'doctored' text, a text which some mediaeval scholar had emended according to his lights. The Harleian MS. of Nonius is an example of the first class of parti-coloured MSS. Its relation to the 'other codices of Nonius remained a puzzle until the late Mr. Onions showed that it was nothing else than a copy of the Florence Nonius, and that the Florence MS. had up and down its pages corrections taken from a lost MS. of superior quality. But that it is the latter class to which the British Museum MS. belongs is indicated by a curious epigram at the end:—

Exemplar mendum tandem me compulit
ipsum
Cunctantem nimium Plautum exemplarier
istum;
Ne graspius (*leg. graphicus*) mendis proprias
idiota repertis
Adderet, et liber hic falso patre falsior
esset.

The miswriting *graspicus* for *graphicus*, which I would refer to the scribe's confusion of a suprascript 'daseia' or Greek

rough breathing (a common symbol for *h* in Carolingian MSS.) with the letter *s*, shows us that the epigram is not the composition of the scribe of the British Museum codex, but has been copied by him from his original.

Now an 'emended' text of this kind, on which some mediaeval scholar (like the Abbot Lupus) had expended his modicum of classical learning, would be in great request in monastery scriptoriums, either for the purpose of being copied or of being used to correct the copy of another text. The fragmentary MS. (containing *Capt.* 400–555) in the Ottobonian collection at the Vatican Library (*O*) seems to exhibit this 'emended' text, as one may see by comparing its readings with those of the British Museum MS. in the Critical Apparatus of the new Ritschl edition.¹ So did the MS used by Osbernus, the Gloucester monk, for his *Panormia*; if we may infer this from his quotation of *Curc.* 56 *pandit saltum saviis* in the 'emended' form *pandit saltum saviu*. And the Leyden MS. (*V*) has been corrected from

¹ With these changes and additions: the reading of *J* in *Capt.* 465 is *honerauerit* not 'honor-,' in v. 467 *oceperit* not '-pit'; *J* has, like *O*, in v. 413 *herum*, v. 417 *setius*, v. 418 *uostram*, v. 464 *lubens*, v. 465 *omnes* (in contracted form), v. 480 *agit hoc*, v. 483 *menstrualis*, v. 450 *Quem*, v. 481 *Ubi*, v. 484 *Scini*: *O* has, like *J*, in v. 494 *His*, v. 510 *phylocratem*, v. 538 *imparatam* (*E* has *in*, not 'im,' followed by the same letter, *p* with contraction-stroke, as was used for the first three letters of *parata* in the previous part of the line, but the scribe has expanded the contraction symbol by writing *er* above the *p*, so as to make *imparatam*): both *J* and *O* have in v. 423 *adest* written as one word in v. 469 *macumam*.

a text of this kind, as I have been able to assure myself by an examination of this MS.¹ The corrections to which I refer are all in a light yellow ink and can, except in the case of erasures, be easily distinguished from the original writing of the scribe and from other occasional corrections in black ink, which are probably due to the scribe himself. The light ink corrections begin with the first page of the MS. and continue till about v. 800 of the *Captivi*. If one looks at Prof. Schoell's collation² of the Leyden MS. in the preface to the *Casina*, pp. xxi. sqq., one will see how exactly these corrections (marked by him V²) in the Leyden MS. reproduce the 'emended' text which is presented to us in *J*.

The Leyden MS., like the British Museum MS., belongs to the beginning of the twelfth century. In the same century, but at the

¹ Through the kindness of the Leyden Librarian the MS. was deposited for a time at the Bodleian Library.

² I venture to differ from Prof. Schoell in regard to the Leyden reading in *Aul.* 234. It seems to me that *memordicus* of V¹ has had an apex put over the *e* by V². This is a common practice of the V²-corrector when he wishes to indicate that a long monosyllable like *me*, *te*, *se*, is to be read as a separate word, apart from the longer word with which the scribe has joined it (cf. *Capt.* 692 *tuaste* V¹, *tuasté* V²; 675 *credite* V¹, *credité* V². These are to be understood as corrections to *tuas te*, *credi te*). A recent corrector has added two strokes above the *u*, that is to say, has changed *mordicus* into *mordiciis*. It is true that this recent corrector sometimes retraces with his black ink the light brown ink-strokes of the V²-corrector (e.g. the *s* of *res* in *Aul.* 544 seems to be superscript by V² and rewritten by the recent corrector), but he has not in my judgment done so in this case. These strokes above the letters of *memordicus* have thus no signification that the order should be transposed to *mordicus me*. In *Aul.* 401 sq. it should be noticed that the addition *tu istum* . . . *miki* is by V². I do not know whether the following points are worth mention: *Capt.* 1 *c marg.* (i.e. *claptus*) V²; 9 *profugiens* V¹, *fugiens* V² (V² has put a dot under each of the three letters *pro*); 98 *huc* V¹, *hunc* V²; 110 *a marg.* (i.e. *a[duorte]*) V²; 297 *scio* V¹, *scito* V²; 337 *redimator* V¹, *-tur* V²; 385 *Philocrates* PHI. ut V¹, *del. PHI.* V²; 432 *fidem* V¹, *fide* V²; 538 *imperatam*; 577 *gnatum* V¹, *natum* V²; 605 *credius ut vid.* (whether this or *creduis* was the reading of *E* I could not decide when I examined the MS. last January); 648 *cicinnatus*; 659 *i marg.* V²; 780 *cybum*; 792 *sese* V² *ex sero ut vid.*; 795 in *hac platea*, *1 ex a*; 812 *fecidos* (t V¹ *ut vid.*); *Aul.* 807 *anueram* V¹, *an uera* V². They are for the most part corrections of obvious misprints in Prof. Schoell's collation or relate to minor points of spelling. But one of them, the note on *Capt.* 9, gives additional evidence of the connexion of these light ink corrections in the Leyden MS. with the 'emended' text of the first eight plays. I take it that *fugiens* for *profugiens* in v. 9 was a mere clerical error in the 'emended' copy, like *inde inde* in v. 490. In *Aul.* 659 V² reads *illi sotio tuo*, as *J* reads *illi socio tuo*.

end of it, was written the Milan MS. (*E*) which exhibits the unemended text and has not been, like *V*, corrected from an 'emended' version. The four MSS., *OJVE*, evidently come ultimately from one and the same Archetype, which was itself clearly a mere copy of the original of the Codex Vetus (*B*) and of the Ursinianus (*D*). Where we have the evidence of *D* as well as of *B*, that is to say in *Amph.*, *Asin.*, *Aul.*, *Capt.* 1-503, these four minor MSS. are of little use; but in the remaining portion, where the evidence of *D* is lacking, *Capt.* 504—*fin.*, *Curc.*, *Cas.*, *Cist.*, *Epid.*, they may preserve the true reading in cases where the scribe of *B* has departed from his original.

This view of the relation of *OJVE* to *B* and *D* is, I believe, generally accepted. But on the other hand I believe the relation of *B* to *D* to be as generally misapprehended. An examination of the two MSS. at the Vatican last Christmas forced me to relinquish the common theory that these MSS. in the first eight plays come from different originals. Where *B* is credited with a reading that clearly belongs to an earlier and purer stage than the reading of *D* and the other MSS., the reading is in each case due to a corrector, who has used a superior MS. that has now been lost. Thus in *Amph.* 619 *tibi*, omitted in the other MSS. has been added by this corrector in *B*. The word did not stand in the original of *B*, but was taken by the corrector from another MS. The scribe of *D* had a habit of omitting small words (e.g. *Aul.* 4 *om. est* *D*, 44 *om. ex* *D*, 98 *om. meas* *D*, 183 *om. ut* *D*) and the text of *D* is in this respect inferior to the corresponding portion of text in *B*. But all the indications point to *B* and *D* being direct copies of the self-same original, so far as regards the earlier plays of Plautus.

In a recently published pamphlet, on *The Palatine Text of Plautus*, I have tried to establish the theory that the 'codex optimus,' from which were derived these peculiar corrections in the first eight plays in *B*, was nothing but the minuscule Archetype of all our existing minuscule MSS. of Plautus; and this Archetype I have made the immediate original of the MS. of which *B* and *D* are copies. If this be so, our minuscule MS. authority for the first eight plays of Plautus may be classed in these divisions:—

- (1) readings of the minuscule Archetype, as exhibited in corrections in *B*.
- (2) readings of a copy of this Archetype, as exhibited in the text of *B* and *D*.

- (3) readings of a copy of this copy, as exhibited in (1) the text of *E* and *V*, and, in a 'doctored' form, in (2) the text of *O* and *J*, and the corrections in *V*.

A passage of a hundred lines in the *Captivi*, vv. 400-500, where the evidence of all these MSS. is available, shows the relation in which they stand to one another. For instance in v. 466, where the Parasite is abusing the 'hungriffulness' of the day on which he cannot secure an attractive invitation to dinner:—

Neque jejuniosiore nec magis ecfertum fame
Vidi,

the phrase *ecfertum fame* 'chock full of hunger' appears in BD with *ecfertum*, in EV¹ *ecfrtum*, in OJV² *effractum*. That is to say, the original of BD had *ecfertum*; its copy, the Archetype of the other minuscule MSS., had the corruption *ecfrtum*, which in the 'doctored' text was changed to *effractum*. This is a typical case and a host of other instances might be put beside it.

W. M. LINDSAY.

A PARIS MS. OF THE LETTERS TO ATTICUS.

Paris, Lat. Nouv. Fonds, 16, 248.

THIS beautifully written MS. does not appear to have been hitherto used by critics. Even Lehmann, who in his treatise '*de Ciceronis ad Atticum epistulis recensendis*' describes and gives select readings from two Paris MSS. which he collated, viz. 8536 [P] and 8538 [R], does not mention it. Recently, while looking at a number of MSS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale, I was struck by its appearance, and made some examination of its readings, the results of which I now proceed to state.

The MS. was written in Italy, and cannot be assigned to a later period than the beginning of the fifteenth century. It appeared to me distinctly older than 8536 [P], which Lehmann calls early fifteenth. At the foot of the first page it has in large letters the signature AN. BER., presumably the name of an early, and possibly its original, possessor. It belonged at one time to Cardinal Richelieu and afterwards to the Sorbonne, from which it was recently transferred to the National Library. It was intended to be an *édition de luxe*, but was left in an unfinished state. In the later books the illuminations have not been filled in, and there are other marks of imperfection. The Greek words are regularly entered until fol. 106b, but after this blank spaces are left to receive them. Thus the whole of fol. 150b is left vacant (*Att.* ix. 3. 4) and on ff. 114b, 115a there is a blank of a page and a half.

The MS. consists of 258 folios, and contains, in addition to the *Letters to Atticus*, those to Brutus and Quintus, and the

spurious letter to Octavian. These are distributed as follows,

- 1-16a. *Epistolae ad D. Brutum* (ending in the middle of the page).
16a-49a. *Epistolae ad Quintum fratrem* (ending in the middle of the page).
49a-51b. *Epistola ad Octavianum*.
52a-258. *Epistolae ad Atticum*, i.—xvi. 16. B.

The MS. contains the passage in the first book [i. 18. 1,—19. 11] omitted in the Medicean [M], but ends with it, omitting the last four letters of the sixteenth book. The neglect with which the MS. has been treated is probably due to the latter fact, since at first sight it would appear to be an ordinary copy of M.

The first part of the MS., which I term π , viz. from fol. 1 to fol. 106b, is written by one scribe, who, however, more than once modified his style of penmanship. He begins in large square characters—then, on fol. 7, he changed his pen and contracting the size of his letters adopts a smaller and beautiful hand. Foll. 13b-44a are written in thinner ink: on 44b he returns to his second manner, which he maintains until he ends on fol. 106b in *fine paginae* with the words *valde probari* [*Att.* vi. 1. 8]. The rest of the MS. was written by a second hand, obviously that of a less expert calligrapher.

With the change in the hands comes a very important change in the character of the contents. After fol. 106b π is an ordinary apograph of M. Previously to

this it belongs to the family of MSS. independent of M, the existence of which has been demonstrated by Lehmann, which he terms Σ . He gives a list of passages (pp. 45, 46) characteristic of Σ . Upon comparing the readings of π with those of Σ in fourteen passages of book i. I found that they were without exception identical. I therefore judged it proper to make some further examination of the MS., a task rendered simple by the various test-passages given in Lehmann's admirable work.

Lehmann includes in his Σ group six MSS., ENHOPR. Of these only ORP are complete, E is really a collection of excerpts, while N and H contain the earlier books only. N ends with vii. 21. 1, H with vii. 22. 2, but Lehmann remarks that the first writer in H ends at vi. 1. 6, *i.e.* two sections before π , the rest being added by a new scribe. He regards NH as *gemelli*, and makes the interesting conjecture that they are derived from a lost *codex Pistoriensis* mentioned by Leonardo Arretino in a letter to Niccolò Niccoli, and said by him to contain only the first seven books, together with those to Brutus and Quintus [p. 145].

The Paris MS. is up to vi. 1. 8 most intimately connected with Lehmann's H. now at Piacenza [cod. Landianus 8], which he ascribes to the beginning of the fifteenth or end of the fourteenth century. Their connexion is sufficiently established by the striking variants found only in them, *e.g.*

iii. 7. 3. *nec ubi dimissurus: nec cui dimissurus* E, *nec ui dimissurus* N, *nec uidi dimissurus* π H.

iii. 15. 4. *laetere unus: latere unus* π H, *latere uiuis* N, *laceremus* P.

v. 1. 3. *sumptus* ENOP: *supradicta* π H.

It is, however, proved definitely by the curious omissions peculiar to the two MSS. Lehmann notes the existence of numerous *lacunae* in H, and quotes six cases from books ii. and iii. In all of these π is similarly defective. This test proves indubitably that π and H are derived from one common source, unless indeed one of them is copied from the other. That π should be copied from H is out of the question, since H does not contain the Greek words, which are regularly entered in π by the first hand. Also in a number of cases the readings of π appeared to me more ancient than those of H.

Lehmann gives a number of readings to

show that H is independent of M, of which twenty-one are taken from i.-vi. 1, 8.

In thirteen of these π agrees, i. 17. 7, 20. 2; ii. 1. 1 and 4, 6. 1; iii. 8. 2; iv. 3. 6, 19. 1; v. 5. 1, 9. 1, 19. 1, 21. 5 and 7. To these may be added iv. 22 *anti* π , *Antij* H, *ante* M, and ii. 12. 1, *plebium* π , *plebeium* H, *tr. plebium* M, where the readings are practically identical. There remain five cases of difference. Three of these are especially interesting, since π supplies the missing link between H and M, thus showing that Lehmann has sometimes been too hasty in claiming an independent origin for readings really due to conjecture. I do not for a moment wish to cast any doubt upon the classification of Lehmann, with which I entirely agree, but candour compels me to state the facts. The cases are:—

i. 1. 3. *et is: eius* M, *ei is* π , *et is* H.

ii. 18. 2. *hac tamen in oppensione: ac t. in o* M π , *hac . . .* H.

iv. 7. 1. *di irati: durati* M, *därati* π , *dii irati* H.

The other differences are:

iv. 15. 2. *a tot tuis: so* H, *a totius* M¹, *a totis tuis* M², *a tuis* π .

iii. 14. 2. *veni: so* H with the *v.c.* of Lambinus, *i.e.* Torn., and the same MS. *teste Bosio*. M gives *ii*, π *iii*. This is a curious and interesting case. But for the evidence of the Torn., which comes from two sources, it would have been natural to consider *ueni* a development from *iii*.

Lehmann gives eleven cases in which H has interpolations as compared with other MSS. of the Σ family. In one only of these does the interpolation appear in π , viz. ii. 19, 2 *sibilare: sibi laudare* π H. This would seem to show that the tradition of π is purer than that of H. In three cases the corruption in π seems to explain that in H.

ii. 24. 4. *uitae taedet ita sunt: vita et edet ita sunt* π , an ordinary instance of faulty division, *victa et decreta sunt* H.

i. 15. 1. *curaque <et> effice ut: curaque effice* π (*curaque effice ut* M), *effice curaque ut* H.

ii. 24. 3. *noctem et nocturnam: noctem et nocturnalem* π , *nocturae et nocturnalibus* H.

It has already been mentioned that another MS. N, Laurent 49, XIV XV century, is closely connected with H. Lehmann gives a number of readings characteristic of NH [pp. 143, 4], nineteen of which are taken from the books contained

in π . In five cases only does π agree with NH, i. 17. 5, 8; i. 16. 6, 9; v. 21. 3, while in eleven it agrees with the other MSS. of the Σ group against NH, viz. i. 9. 1, 17. 10; ii. 1. 2, 16. 2, 21. 1 and 4; iii. 4, 7. 1, 12. 1, 15. 7; iv. 1. 2. The remaining cases are:

i. 16. 1. *quaeris ex me: quaeris ad me N, qu. a me π H.*

ii. 16. 2. *se leges: si leges π , si legis NH.*

iv. 1. 8. *vehementer te requirimus: vehementer terere π , vehementer terrere H, vehementer terrei si te requirimus N.*

A point of interest is the possible relationship of $\text{NH}\pi$ to the Ambrosian excerpts E, which, as Lehmann points out, are also characterized by *lacunae*, occasionally corresponding with those in H [and π]. Thus vi. 1. 1, 2 the words *nec oikoroipav . . . paulo secus* are omitted alike by $\text{EH}\pi$, a coincidence which can hardly be due to accident.

I was precluded by lack of time from making more than a cursory examination of the Paris MS. As, owing to other occupations, I have no hope of being able to collate

it, I judge it best to indicate its existence and commend it to the attention of some more leisured scholar. I do not predict any striking results, but it is certain that an examination of it will throw considerable light upon the family history and alliances of the Σ group. A comparison of $\text{NH}\pi$ should enable us to reconstitute with some certainty the common archetype, whether this was the *codex Pistoriensis* or some other MS. The existence of these three MSS., all of them defective as well as closely allied, seems to show beyond question that there was in Italy in the fourteenth century a *decurtatus* or mutilated MS., independent of M, and honeycombed by *lacunae*. I would further suggest that other MSS. which end with M at xvi. 16 B, may deserve some further inspection in the earlier books before they are set aside as useless, since these, as is the case with π , may have been copied from a different and mutilated archetype. The criticism of the *Letters to Atticus* is so fascinating a subject and so many difficulties remain unsolved that some further examination of this and the kindred MSS. is not likely to prove unrewarded.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

NEW DATA PRESUMABLY FROM SUETONIUS' *LIFE OF LUCRETIVS*.

IN *Mnemosyne* (1895, part ii.), Dr. Woltjer discusses at considerable length the new data from Borgius' preface to a complete but still unprinted edition of Lucretius containing Pontanus' text. It has always seemed to me that these data, which a number of scholars believe were originally abridged from Suetonius, have probably passed through a number of hands, before they reached the form in which Borgius laid his hands upon them in the preface to some MS. of Lucretius. Supposing these data to be derived from Suetonius, this need not be inconsistent with the fact that they come down to us mixed up with matter from another and later source. Probably indeed Borgius's use of the word *colligere* (*J. of Phil.* 1895, p. 222) implies that he gathered his information from more sources than one. Certainly Woltjer has made it probable that the clause *matre natus divitiis sterili* was derived by Borgius (or Pontanus) from his recollection of a

line of Serenus Sammonicus, who, dealing with sterility, says:—

*hoc poterit magni quartus monstrare
Lucreti*

i.e. the fourth book of Lucretius where the subject is treated. Very acutely Woltjer suggests that some scholar either made the emendation *partus* for *quartus* or made the change by a lapse of memory. Another critic, writing later in the *Berliner Philol. Wochens.* (20 April, 1895), says that the *editio princeps* of Serenus is reported to contain the reading *partus*. For this very clever suggestion Dr. Woltjer deserves credit. Again, as to the degree of probability that the date given by Borgius for the birth of Lucretius is derived from Suetonius rather than inferred by Borgius from Jerome's well-known data, this depends largely on the weight which Borgius' new data as a whole carry. On

this point scholars like Dr. J. S. Reid and Dr. Radinger differ from Dr. Woltjer.

But I believe that the criticism attributed to Cicero is one which, from its intrinsic interest, is likely to have come to us in fairly accurate form, even if it should be somewhat abridged. Woltjer takes a very different view of this, he says:—

‘Quod praeterea dicit Borgius Ciceronem monuisse Lucretium ut in translationibus servaret verecundiam, ex quibus duo potissimum loci ab eo relati esse dicuntur, *Neptuni scilicet lacunas et caeli cavernas*, id tam certe et tanta cum fiducia dicitur ut vix dubitare quis audeat. Attamen locutio quae est *Neptuni lacunas* apud Lucretium non exstat; *salsas—lacunas* 3, 1031, *salsis—lacunis* 5, 794 scriptum legitur. Ciceronem autem reprehendisse translationem *caeli cavernas* 4, 171, quis credet, cum Cicero ipse scripserit *late caeli lustrare cavernas* Arat. 252?’

‘Haec jam sufficient ut demonstretur omnia quae in praefatione illa Borgiana necnon in iis, quae ego ex commentario Pomponii Laeti exscripsi, nova videantur, mera esse humanistarum commenta.’

Cicero is said to have found fault with an expression, *Neptunni lacunas*, which does not occur in Lucretius’ poem.¹ This, Dr. Woltjer seems to think, confirms his view that Cicero’s criticism is ‘the mere invention of a humanist,’ that is to say, Dr. Woltjer holds that the forger of such a statement would choose to support it by inventing words which are not to be found in Lucretius’ poem, as we have it. To me and to other scholars this seems very unlikely indeed. Of the second instance, *caeli cavernas*, he says: ‘Who could believe that Cicero could have blamed this, since he himself uses the very same phrase in his translation from Aratus?’ Alas, such

¹ As to the use of *Neptunus* for *mare*, Lucretius at ii. 652 ff. makes special allowance for this use of language, and he himself at vi. 1076 has the phrase *Neptuni fluctu*.

inconsistencies are not quite so rare as Dr. Woltjer seems to think. Moreover, so busy a man and so voluminous a writer as Cicero may very well have forgotten some of his own juvenile verses. If we turn to the passage of *De Oratore* (quoted by me in *Journal of Philology*, 1895, p. 223, note 6), we shall find Cicero blaming the expression of Ennius, *caeli fornices*, because there can be no resemblance between a globe and an arch. Dr. Woltjer might equally well maintain, that Cicero could not possibly have found fault with Ennius’ *caeli fornices*, because he himself sins in a precisely similar way in his juvenile *caeli cavernas*.

Why did Pontanus not name the source from which these new data are drawn? In the same way that the scribes who copied the lives of Horace and Lucan, prefixed to different MSS. of these authors, do not state where they found them; simply because these lives were prefixed to the MSS. which they copied and with no name attached. Yet these lives are now universally admitted to be written by Suetonius.

As to the curious matter which Dr. Woltjer found on the fly-leaf of a copy of the Verona edition, these data, if they ever originated from Suetonius, have been so monstrously garbled as to deprive them of all value. The legend as to the potion and Lucretius’ love for Astericos seems like two traditions regarding different persons jumbled together and indeed flatly contradicts Jerome. It is almost needless to say that no parallel can be drawn between data such as these, derived from such a source, and information embodied in the preface to an edition of Lucretius containing the text of a noted scholar and student of MSS. like Pontanus, a preface which was written by his secretary, (also a distinguished man of letters) and was apparently revised by Pontanus himself.

JOHN MASSON.

Dundee.

NOTE ON PLATO’S *REPUBLIC*, VII. 519 A.

τοῦτο μέντοι, ἦν δ’ ἐγὼ, τὸ τῆς τοιαύτης φύσεως εἰ ἐκ παιδὸς εὐθὺς κοπτόμενον περιεκόπη τὰς τῆς γενέσεως συγγενεῖς (τὰ... συγγενῇ, most recent editions) ὥσπερ μολυβδίδας, αἱ δὲ... κάτω στρέφουσι τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ὥψιν κ.τ.λ.

Stallbaum (1859) translated: *Haec atque talis natura si statim a pueritia ab iis purgata ac circumcisa esset, quae ortui (humanae naturae) adhaerent, etc.* Jowett (first edition) translated: ‘But what if there had been a circumcision of such natures in the

days of their youth; and they had been severed from the leaden weights, as I may call them, *with which they are born into the world*, etc.; and in the last edition of his translation he made only slight changes in this passage, reading, '*which like leaden weights were attached to them at their birth*.' Davies and Vaughan (1879) translate: 'But, I proceeded, if from earliest childhood these characters had been shorn and stripped of these leaden, *earth-born weights*'; and similarly Mr. Purves (1883): 'Had their nature been docked at first, and shorn of its *congenital infirmities*,' and 'circumcised of these leaden scales of its *nativity*.'

To criticise at length the rendering of a single clause of Plato might seem trifling, but here the authority of Stallbaum seems to have carried later interpreters away from the truth in an unusual and instructive fashion. The clause has long caused trouble. Ficinus translated (edition of 1518): *si ab hoc ingenio statim a pueritia amputentur* quae sunt generationis affinia *ceu plumbea pondera*, etc.; but Serranus, in the edition of Stephanus (1542): *si ab huiusmodi natura, inquam, statim ab ineunte aetate amputentur* ea quae ab ortu ipso illis cognata sunt, *veluti plumbea pondera*, etc. But I do not think that any

doubt of the meaning can remain after the examination of the passage in connexion with half a dozen others; Plato is simply continuing the contrast between τὸ γινόμενον or γένεσις and τὸ ὄν or οὐσία. Cf. 485 B ὁ ἄν...δηλοῖ τῆς οὐσίας τῆς αἰὲς οὐσης καὶ μὴ πλανωμένης ὑπὸ γενέσεως καὶ φθορᾶς, and 508 D ὅταν μὲν, οὐ καταλάμπει ἀληθείᾳ τε καὶ τὸ ὄν..., ὅταν δὲ εἰς τὸ τῷ σκότῳ κεκραμένον, τὸ γιγνόμενον τε καὶ ἀπολλύμενον, 518 C τὸ ὄργανον ᾧ καταμανθάνει ἕκαστος...ἐκ τοῦ γιγνομένου περιεκτεόν εἶναι, ἕως ἂν εἰς τὸ ὄν κ.τ.λ., 521 D τί ἂν οὖν εἴη—μάθημα ψυχῆς ὁλοκὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ γιγνομένου ἐπὶ τὸ ὄν; 525 B σοφῶ δὲ διὰ τὸ τῆς οὐσίας ἀπτεόν εἶναι, γενέσεως ἐξαναδύντι, 526 E Οὐκοῦν εἰ μὲν οὐσίαν ἀναγκάζει θεάσασθαι, προσήκει, εἰ δὲ γένεσιν, οὐ προσήκει, and 534 A δόξαν μὲν περὶ γένεσιν, νόησιν δὲ περὶ οὐσίαν. Thus in the passage before us τὰς τῆς γενέσεως συγγενεῖς must mean *what is akin to BECOMING*, in contrast with *being*. Whether we say that the attraction to the feminine *μολυβδόδας* was in Plato's mind or due to a copyist, is immaterial. For the genitive with συγγενεῖς, any one may compare 403 A, 487 A, 554 D, 560 A, etc.

T. D. SEYMOUR.

FURTHER NOTE ON PLATO, *REP.* X. 597 E.

PERHAPS I may be permitted to illustrate my suggested interpretation a little further, by pointing out in what way a really important question is involved in the difference of opinion between Mr. Mayor and myself. It is my conviction that the formal theory of separate ideas ought not to be presupposed in the interpretation of Plato where it is not quite explicitly insisted on in the text. To Mr. Mayor it seems quite natural to refer a substantive βασιλέως, occurring without any sign of differentiation, to one peculiar grade of reality as normally distinguished by Plato into idea, thing, or imitation. To me, holding no doubt a different conception of the place of the so-called 'ideas' in Plato's mind, this reference appears inconceivably harsh and uncalled for, and I am quite unable to read the passage as Platonic Greek if I force that meaning upon it.

To my argument that βασιλέως occurs without any distinguishing mark (such as ὁ ἔστι κλῆν, κλῆνς ὄντως οὐσης, ἡ ἐν τῇ φύσει οὐσα) Mr. Mayor answers by insisting on

the words καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας in this sentence, and parallel expressions elsewhere. I may most plainly state my point, which he does not appear to me to see, by asking whether Plato could possibly have written in the present sentence τρίτος τις ἀπὸ κλῆνς κ. τῆς ἀληθείας πεφυκώς, supposing that he had been speaking of the carpenter and not of the poet. Is it not clear that the whole emphasis of the sentence would thus be destroyed? The words καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας only set the standard, and when an ordinary substantive is used along with them it is bound to justify its position. This it can only do, if its reference involves a distinction between three objects bearing the same name, by some indication to which of the three it is to be referred. But on the view which still seems to me the simple and natural one, if we read the dialogue attentively and continuously, the differences of reality here implied are not between objects of the same name, but between the king as such, on the one hand, and the oligarch, democrat, or tyrant, repre-

sending the successive removes of moral degradation, on the other. When thus read, the sentence under discussion has at once its full rhetorical and logical weight in every term. We have not to ask 'what kind of a king.' The word king fills the part assigned to it at once with appropriate emphasis.

It is a strange suggestion that in denying the king in this passage to be 'ideal' in the sense required by the contrast with the other kinds of king, I admit of his being an actual Xerxes or Pausanias. I take him to be the βασιλεύς of books iv., viii., and ix., in the account of whom there is no allusion to the theory of separate ideas. All the characters there described are regarded as forming a causally connected series, and it is impossible that the king should be there regarded as an abstract idea any more than the tyrant. But he is treated as nearer to reality in a different and much profounder sense, viz. that his character, that of the good man in general (587 E, where just and unjust men are substituted for king and tyrant as a matter of course), has the note of harmony and constancy which is the criterion of reality (585 C).

From the first and second books, in which the tyrant was accepted as the type of the unjust man (344 A), and the unjust man was alleged to be pursuing a πρᾶγμα ἀληθείας ἐχόμενον (362 A), there follows the necessity of showing that the king, who is to the good man as the tyrant to the bad man, has the

real kinship with ἀλήθεια. This is finally shown in 587 E, and from that point the connection of ἀλήθεια with the king as opposed to the tyrant is taken as obvious and necessary. As is hinted even in 336 A and explained at length in 568 A ff., the poet tends to go with the tyrant, or deteriorated moral personality. And so, I suggest, in 597 E the same connection is reiterated as generally corroborating that disparaging view of imitation which the paradoxical statement of the doctrine of separate ideas has made probable. It is to be remembered that the special ground for recurring to the question of imitation in book x. is not the doctrine of ideas, but the psychology of the soul (595 B ἐπειδὴ χωρὶς ἑκάστα διήρηται τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς εἶδη). It is thus quite natural that the language drawn from the theory of ideas should be corroborated by an appeal to the previous psychological investigation, in which a very similar terminology, that of 'removes,' had already become familiar.

I regard the statement of the doctrine of ideas in *Republic*, x. as paradoxical and exceptional, intended to bring out certain points in the criticism of imitation. I do not believe that any such doctrine formed a permanent background of Plato's thought, and consequently I feel unable to draw it into the interpretation of special passages except where Plato himself takes pains to make it clear that some such paradox is for the moment in his mind.

B. BOSANQUET.

CORRECTIONS IN THE TEXT OF THUCYDIDES' VI.

C. 35, 1 ὁ δῆμος ἐν πολλῇ ἐρίδι ἦσαν, οἱ μὲν ὥς... οὐδ' ἀληθῆ ἐστὶν ἃ λέγει, τοῖς δ' ἐ, εἰ καὶ ἔλθοιεν, τί ἂν δράσειαν.

For ΛΕΓΕΙΤΟΙΣ read ΛΕΓΟΙΤΟΟΙ = λέγοιτο, οἱ. For the sequence οὐδ' ἀληθῆ ἐστὶν ἃ λέγοιτο see Goodwin, *M.T.* § 690.

C. 37, 2 μόλις ἂν μοι δοκοῦσιν, εἰ πόλιν ἐτέραν τσαυτὴν ὅσαι Συράκουσαι εἰσιν ἔλθοιεν ἔχοντες καὶ ὁμοιοὶ οἰκίσαντες τὸν πόλεμον ποιοῦντο.

For οἰκίσαντες read οἰκίσαντες; the sense required is not 'settle in' a place previously existing, but 'found' a new settlement. With this slight change, there is no need to bracket either ἔλθοιεν or ἔχοντες.

C. 64, 1 βουλόμενοι... στρατόπεδον καταλαμβάνειν ἐν ἐπιτηδείῳ καθ' ἡσυχίαν, εἰδότες οὐκ ἂν ὁμοίως δυνήθεις, [καὶ del. Reiske] εἰ... ἐκβιάζοιεν.

Cf. c. 66, 1 καθ' ἡσυχίαν καθίσαν τὸ στράτευμα ἐς χωρίον ἐπιτιγείον. For δυνήθεις[καὶ] i.e. δυνήθεντε CICA₁ read δυνήθεντε CICA < ΘICA >₁, i.e. δυνήθεις καθίσαι, εἰ... ἐκβιάζοιεν, sc. τὸ στράτευμα. The blunder (*lipography*) is an old one, as the scholiast tries to explain the text with καὶ in it.

C. 83, 4 τὴν τε γὰρ ἐκεῖ ἀρχὴν εἰρήκαμεν διὰ δέος ἔχειν καὶ τὰ ἐνθάδε διὰ τὸ αὐτὸ ἦκειν... καταστήσομενοι.

Stahl reads ἦκομεν, since the latter part of the sentence does not correspond to anything that Euphemus, the Athenian envoy to Camarina, has previously said.

Read τὴν τε γὰρ ἐκεῖ ἀρχὴν εἰρήκαμεν διὰ δέος ἔχειν καὶ τὰ ἐνΘΑΔΕ < ΦΑΜΕΝ > ΔΙΑ κ.τ.λ., i.e. ... εἰρήκαμεν διὰ δέος ἔχειν καὶ τὰ ἐνθάδε < φαμέν > διὰ τὸ αὐτὸ ἦκειν... καταστήσομενοι. Thus τὴν ἐκεῖ ἀρχὴν (τὰ ἐνθάδε;

εἰρήκαμεν) (φαμέν; διὰ δέος) (διὰ τὸ αὐτό; ἔχουν) (ἦκειν... καταστησόμενοι. There is in M a small gap after ἐνθάδε, but it is probably not due to erasure.

C. 78, 4. Read, with M only, ἄπερ <ἀν> εἰ ἐς τὴν Καμαριναίαν πρῶτον ἀφίκοντο οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι δεόμενοι ἂν ἐπεκαλείσθε.

Eggeling, with characteristic carelessness, did not see this ἂν, but it is quite plain.

C. 82, 1 δουλείαν δὲ αὐτοὶ τε ἐβούλοντο καὶ ἡμῖν τὸ αὐτὸ ἐπενεγκεῖν.

Herbst, recognizing that δουλείαν ἐβούλοντο is not Greek (Böhme-Widmann's τὴν αὐτὴν δύναται δούλωσιν of i. 141 is surely not parallel) supplies ἐνεγκεῖν from ἐπενεγκεῖν, by one of the ellipses that he admires so much in Thucydides. Believing such an ellipse to be impossible, I propose δουλείαν δὲ αὐτοὶ τε <ἐαυτοῖς> κ.τ.λ., so that ἐπενεγκεῖν may belong to both clauses.

C. 86, 3 δεόμενοι τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν (σωτηρίαν) μὴ προδιδόναι, νομίσαι τε τοῖσδε μὲν κ.τ.λ.

For τε Hude conjectures δέ, but without admitting it into his text. As M gives νομίσαι δέ with the utmost clearness, Eggeling ought to have recorded it. It is clearly better than the τε of the rest.

C. 89, 6 ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῦ ξύμπαντος προύστημεν, δικαιούντες ἐν ᾧ σχήματι μεγίστη ἢ πόλις ἐτίγχανε καὶ ἐλευθερωτάτη οὖσα καὶ ὅπερ ἐδέξάτο τις, τοῦτο ξυνδιασώζειν (ἐπεὶ δημοκρατίαν γε καὶ ἐγινώσκουμεν οἱ φρονούντες τι, καὶ αὐτὸς οὐδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον, ὅσω κἂν [Hude, for καὶ] λαιδορήσαιμι· ἀλλὰ περὶ ὁμολογούμενης ἀνοίας οὐδὲν ἂν καινὸν λέγοιτο), καὶ τὸ μεθιστάναι αὐτὴν οὐκ ἐδόκει ἡμῖν ἀσφαλὲς εἶναι ἡμῶν πολεμίων προσκαθημένων.

In the July number of this *Review*, I

explained οὐδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον as for οὐδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον φρονοῖν. During Dr. Hude's recent visit to England, I had an opportunity of placing my explanation before him. He raised two objections: (1) What is the point of καὶ before ἐγινώσκουμεν? (2) How can the verb be supplied from the participle, φρονούντες, and not from the main verb, ἐγινώσκουμεν? I will add a third. Alcibiades claims, not that he and his party desired to abolish democracy, but that they wished to limit it in some way. They wished to preserve democracy. Now if τὸ μεθιστάναι αὐτὴν = τὸ μεθιστάναι τὴν πόλιν, as it must do according to the received text, the meaning ought to be 'to substitute an *oligarchy* for the democracy'—the very idea that he disclaims (δικαιοῦντες τὸ σχῆμα ξυνδιασώζειν). αὐτὴν ought to be δημοκρατίαν: and it can become so only by printing the passage thus:—

ἡμεῖς . . τοῦτο ξυνδιασώζειν. ἐπεὶ δημοκρατίαν γε καὶ ἐγινώσκουμεν οἱ φρονούντες τι (καὶ αὐτὸς . . λαιδορήσαιμι), καὶ τὸ μεθιστάναι αὐτὴν κ.τ.λ.

When this slight change is made Dr. Hude's objections are no longer formidable. (1) καὶ ἐγινώσκουμεν corresponds to καὶ οὐκ ἐδόκει ἡμῖν: 'we knew its worthlessness, and yet did not dare to change its character': (2) καὶ αὐτὸς κ.τ.λ. is an addition in parenthesis to οἱ φρονούντες τι: 'we sensible men: yes, I could prove that I am one of them.' A parenthesis often begins with καὶ in Thucydides. Lastly it becomes clear why Thucydides wrote ἐγινώσκουμεν, and not ἐγίνωσκον.

E. C. MARCHANT.

NOTE ON HORACE, *ODES*, I. 28.

THAT this ode is a monologue seems now generally agreed; but I think scholars would not have taken so long to reach this result if one point had been grasped, which I have nowhere seen stated. It is that the poem is intended for an inscription. It is an ἐπιτύμβιον for a cenotaph, and is thus to be brought into relation with the many poems of this kind (especially about persons lost at sea) to be found in the seventh book of the *Palatine Anthology* (see the introduction to Mackail's *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*, pp. 71 sqq.). The following list of epigrams will show the frequency of the topic in the book: by Simonides 496

(κενεοὶ τάφοι) and 510; by Callimachus 271, 272; by Leonidas of Tarentum (3rd century B.C.) 652, 654. Epigram 273 is by 'Leonidas,' but whether the Tarentine or the Alexandrian, who lived under Nero, we know not. The tomb is here called ψεύστης λίθος, and the phrase δνοφερῆς κύματα πανδυσίης Ὀρίωνος may be an anticipation (or an echo) of Horace's *deveni rapidus comes Orionis Notus*. Epigram 397 is by Erycius the Thessalian (1st century B.C.) for the cenotaph of a shipwrecked mariner; 404, by Zonas of Sardis (also 1st century B.C.), is spoken by a stranger who gives the 'pulveris exigui munera' to a shipwrecked corpse;

cf. 277 by Callimachus. Epigram 495, by Alcaeus of Messene (*flor.* 200 B.C.), 497 by Damagetus (*flor.* 200 B.C.), 499 by Theaetetus (perhaps 3rd century B.C.), 500 by Asclepiades (*flor.* 290 B.C.), 539 by Perses (*flor.* 300 B.C.) are all inscriptions for cenotaphs in memory of shipwrecked persons. There are many others of doubtful date, or later than Horace. In some of these the word *κωφός* is used to express the 'dummy' monument; 392 *κωφὴν λίθακα*, 395 *κωφὸν γράμμα* (where also note the phrase *συρμὸς Ὠρίωνος*).

If we assume that there was a well-known 'tomb of Archytas' somewhere on the coast, and that the monument to the unknown mariner of Horace's ode stood near it, all follows naturally. An epitaph, it is needless to say, often takes the form of an address by the shade of the dead man, and this is sometimes the case with cenotaphs (e.g. *Anth. Pal.* vii. 500). 'You yonder, Archytas, were drowned and buried: I was

drowned but have not been buried: whoever finds my body, please bury it' is briefly the argument. Two things have disguised the epigraphic character of the poem: its length and its metre. As to the length, it was natural that Horace should yield to the temptation of dwelling on the personality of Archytas. As to the metre, Horace had clearly made up his mind under no circumstances to be seduced into writing elegiacs, and so avoided the metre in which an epitaph would have been most recognizable. He had selected his own function—*princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos deduxisse modos*; he left to his contemporaries and juniors the working out of the problem of the Latin pentameter. It is to be noted that, where (as in *Odes*, iv. 7) he reproduces the last half of the pentameter, he shows no special predilection for what became under Ovid the stereotyped rhythm of it.

E. S. THOMPSON.

NOTE ON THEMISTIUS' PARAPHRASE OF *PHYSICS*, II. 9.

IN Themistius' Paraphrase of Aristotle's *Physics*, ii. 9 (Teubner text, p. 201), occur the words: *εἴτε δὲ τῶν φύσει τι γιγνομένων εἴτε τῶν κατὰ τέχνην λαμβάνοις, εὐρήσεις ἂν ὡς φυσικὸς ἐξετάξης, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τὴν ὕλην καὶ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον αἴτιον περιεχόμενον ὁρισμένοις γὰρ τὸ ἔργον τοῦ πρίειν, ὅτι διαίρεσις τοιάδε ἔχων, εὐθὺς ἐμφαίνεται ἡ τοῦ σιδήρου χρεία, καὶ οὕτω μὲν δύνανται [lege δυνάμει] καὶ ἐξ ἐπιλογισμοῦ τινος, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ. τί ἐστιν ὀργή; ζέσις τοῦ περικαρδίου αἵματος δι' ὅρεξιν ἀντιληπύσεως.*

The necessity of the emendation proposed will appear from the following explanatory translation: 'But whether you take a product of nature or of art, you will find, if you inquire as a physicist, the matter and the necessary cause included in the same definition [*sc.* with the form or essence]. For on defining the work or function of sawing as such or such a dividing of the parts of wood the need of the iron is at once made manifest. And in such cases it is potentially, and as the result of an inference

[*sc.* that the definition involves the matter and the *condicio sine qua non* or necessary cause] but often explicitly [in actuality]. [For example] What is anger? A ferment of the pericardial blood caused by a desire for revenge.'

A period or colon should of course be placed after *χρεία*. The Teubner text as it stands cannot be construed so as to account for the three *καί*'s, and would yield no satisfactory sense if it could. If further confirmation is needed, it is found in the words of the Commentary of Simplicius *ad loc.*: *ἐπειδὴ ἐν πολλοῖς ὁρισμοῖς ἐμπεριλαμβάνεται καὶ ἡ ὕλη ποτὲ μὲν δυνάμει ἐν τῷ τοῦ εἶδους ὁρισμῷ... ποτὲ δὲ ἐνεργείᾳ*. The thought of the passage goes back to Plato, *Cratylus*, 389. Compare the words of Simplicius: *συναναφαίνεται ὅτι ἐκ σιδήρου δὲ τοὺς δδόντας εἶναι, with Plato, Crat. 389 C: τὸ φύσει γὰρ ἐκάστω, ὡς εἶκε, τρύπανον πεφυκὸς εἰς τὸν σίδηρον δὲ ἐπίστασθαι τιθέναι*.

PAUL SHOREY.

University of Chicago.

NOTE ON *IL*. XVI. 99.

Π 97 αἱ γὰρ, Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναίη καὶ
 Ἀπόλλων,
 μήτε τις οὖν Τρώων θάνατον φύγοι,
 ὅσσοι ἔασι,
 μήτε τις Ἀργείων, νῶιν δ' ἐκδύμεν
 ὀλεθρον,
 ὅφρ' οἶσι Τροίης ἱερὰ κρήδεμνα λύωμεν.
 (La Roche, 1873. Monro, 1896.)

THE athetesis of these lines by Aristarchus and the earlier suspicion of them by Zenodotus (ὑπώπτευκεν) proceed from the idea that the morbid feeling exhibited in such wishes would be too extreme for Achilles, who has wider sympathies (καὶ ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς οὐ τοιοῦτος, συμπαθὴς δέ, Ariston.). As Dr. Leaf shows in his commentary, we are not bound to reject the lines on such grounds, and it seems equally unnecessary to condemn them on account of the verbal difficulties of l. 99. These indeed are only such as would naturally be developed by the procedure of ancient critics, whose crude notions of archaic speech are often of a singular character. There can be little doubt for instance that some of the Alexandrines cherished the belief that the nom. νῶι could take the ν ἐφέλκυστικόν. A fine example of νῶιν arrested in the very act of displacing νῶι or νῶ may be found by the curious in Θ 428, v. scholia of Didymus and Aristonicus *ad loc.* For other instances v. Δ 767, X 216, Θ 377. It is only fair to say that Zenodotus seems to have been the chief offender in this particular. Again we are equally obliged to dissent from the view of Herodianus (and probably of Aristarchus, says Dr. Leaf), that ἐκδύμεν should be read here, as the infinitive, with the extraordinary ellipse of γένοιτο, 'may it be possible for us to escape etc.'

Many modern critics however commit quite as serious an error in the sphere of metre, when they assume that the ι of νῶι can here be lengthened by the ictus alone. Only a very imperfect appreciation of Homeric scansion combined with an overmastering passion for anomalies could possibly induce any one to accept as satisfactory

νῶι δ' ἐκδύμεν ὀλεθρον

with nothing but an iambus for the fourth foot. ἐκδύμεν is Hermann's correction of ἐκδύμεν (ἐκδύμεν L), and in point of form is unexceptionable:

ἔβην : βαίην :: ἔδυν : δύνην

Similar forms with the diphthong υι are now read in ι 377 ἀναδύνῃ, σ 348 δύνῃ, Ω 665 δαινύτο, σ 248 δαινύιατ' (ο), σ 238 λελύντο (not λελύντο, which is erroneous), and possibly Σ 473 ἀνύτο (*v.l.* ἀνοίτο). So much for the admission of the diphthong -υι.

We come now to consider the contracted forms of the plur. in -νύμεν -νύτε -νύεν.

These must undoubtedly be regarded as the recognized and predominant forms; but besides these there are the longer and uncontracted forms, which fell into disuse at a comparatively early date, but yet occasionally survived even to Macedonian times—Thuc. viii. 53, 4 φαίσαν: Hdt. iii. 61, 1 εἰδείσαν: Xen. διαβαίσαν: Dem. γνοίσαν: Plato *Phaedr.* 279 δοίσαν. This last verb we have complete in the plural—Hdt. vii. 135 δοίστε: Plato *Men.* 96 δοίμεν.

There is no occasion to multiply such instances. Indeed we shall be told that they are all *grammaticorum insomnia*, and within the precincts of the unadulterated Attic this dictum of Dawes may be allowed to possess the fullest validity. No objection therefore need be taken to the emendation of Eur. *Cycl.* 132 δρώμεν ἄν and Eur. *Ion* 943 φαίμεν ἄν to συνδρώμεν ἄν (Dawes) and συμφαίμεν ἄν (Dindorf) respectively. But with the language of the Homeric poems the case is somewhat different. There is one indisputable instance of the long form, which, however much it may have made our Quintilians stare and gasp, cannot be got rid of by any correction with the least shadow of probability:—

P 733 σταίσαν, τῶν δὲ τράπετο χρώς, οὐδέ τις ἔτλη

Why should we not reinforce this solitary instance of a formation, which must have marked a primitive stage of the Greek language, by reading here, as the metre imperatively requires,

νῶ δ' ἐκδύνμεν ὀλεθρον,

when by so doing we recover and preserve a rare specimen of an early and once, if I may say so, entirely unobjectionable usage?

T. L. AGAR.

NOTE ON VERGIL, *GEORGIC* II. 501—502.

'Non ferrea jura,
Insanumque forum aut populi tabularia
vidit.'

It is obvious that a literal translation such as 'public archives' produces a sad anti-climax, and spoils a noble passage. *Happy and innocent the peasant's life: he has never known the miseries of a great city; never seen the iron rigour of the law, the mad turmoil of the forum, or the public archives.* It sounds like saying, 'Happy the rural swain who has never known London; never seen the iron rigour of its law-courts, the mad uproar of its Stock Exchange, or—the Rolls Office.' This is surely a case where translation must give place to paraphrase; where for the word itself, so pointless in English, we must substitute the cruelties denoted by the word. Indeed, the fact that Vergil places *tabularia* last among the three evils of city-life is not more significant of the hateful sense it bore to him, than the

omission of any adjective such as he felt to be needful to lend ferocity to the two previous evils.

Yet Conington's Prose Translation has 'public archives': and Mr. Mackail is content with 'the archives of the people.' Moreover, neither the edition of Conington, nor that of Mr. Sidgwick, offers any answer whatever to the natural, the inevitable question, 'Why the Rolls Office?' And I find the same curious silence in three or four other editions. Yet Forbiger had long ago given the necessary explanation in his note *ad locum*: 'hoc est, nullum vectigal, nec portorium, nec pascua, a populo publicanus conduxit, quarum redemptionum tabulae, publica instrumenta, in tabulario servabantur.'

A translation might therefore run: 'who has never seen the iron rigour of the law, the mad turmoil of the Forum, or the grinding injustice of the tax-farmers.'

W. RAY.

LEO'S *PLAUTUS*.

[*Plauti Comoediae, recensuit et emendavit FRIDERICUS LEO; volumen prius (Amph.—Merc.). 1895. Pp. viii., 478. 18 M.; vol. alterum (Mil.—Truc. Vid. Fragm.). 1896. Pp. 575. 20 M. Berlin: Weidmann.]*

PROF. LEO'S *Plautinische Forschungen* appeared last year along with the first volume of the critical edition of the text and was noticed in vol. x. p. 206 of this Journal. The second volume of text, which has just come from the press, completes the handsome contribution of the Göttingen Professor to the study of Plautus. Plautus students may now congratulate themselves on the possession of three excellent editions, each with characteristics of its own; first, the large edition by Ritschl's pupils, Loewe (now dead), Goetz, and Schoell, the last volume of which appeared in 1894; then the small Teubner text by Goetz and Schoell (Leipzig, 1893-6); and now the edition of Prof. Leo. I hope that so generous provision may attract to this field of study many scholars who have hitherto been deterred by the difficulty of

the subject. It is the field which of all others is most in need of workers and where the richest harvests are to be reaped.

The chief characteristic of the new text will, I think, be acknowledged to be its close adherence to the MSS. Leo spares his readers the necessity of constant reference to the critical apparatus in order to guard themselves against accepting as Plautine what is merely 'editors' Plautus.' Since Ritschl's time the conviction has been growing stronger and stronger that it is in adherence to the MSS. that safety lies, and that in particular no reading which is supported both by the Ambrosian Palimpsest and by the other MSS. should be lightly set aside. Goetz and Schoell on the completion of their larger edition, the earlier volumes of which suffered from the want of that full knowledge of the readings of the Palimpsest which was supplied by Studemund's *Apograph* (1889), have met the demand for a less vigorously edited text. Their small Teubner edition is little more than a reproduction of the text of the MSS. with no emendations save such as are or seem indubitably correct

and with free use of the obelus throughout the plays to denote that a line is corrupt. A text of this kind is useful for the collector of statistics of grammar, prosody, or the like; for it saves him from the danger of including in his list words or forms whose position in the text is not thoroughly established. But it cannot quite satisfy the ordinary student, who wishes to have his author's writings in a readable, as well as a reliable form. Prof. Leo's text stands midway between the two texts of Goetz and Schoell in respect of its adherence to the MSS., just as his critical apparatus has neither the fulness of the large nor the extreme compression of the small Leipzig edition. As a specimen of the three I give *Truc.* 57 with its accompanying critical note in (1) the large, (2) the small Leipzig edition, (3) Leo's:—

(1) *Atque haec celamus clam ómnis summa indústriá.*

haec (hec L) celamus DL. haec caelamus CZ. heccelumus B. clam omnis summa Sch. l.s.s. p. 60. clámína D. nos clammina BC (nos ex v. 58). nos Damna LZ. nos damna una Camerarius. nos clam mira (vel summa) Gronovius. damna nos Bothius. nostra damna Spengelius.

(2) *Atque haec celamus nós clam †mina indústriá.*

celamus vel celumus.

(3) *atque haec celamus nos clam magna indústriá.*

celumus B. clam cf. Poen. 1239; damna recc. mina, correxi (summa Gronovius), cf. Cas. 45 Vidul. 42.

The references in the last note have the object of proving that *celare clam* and *magna indústriá* are permissible phrases in *Plautus*. The student will find throughout Leo's critical apparatus a wealth of grammatical and explanatory comments of the kind.

It will be seen from this single specimen that the new text supplies a long-felt want. Unfortunately its practical usefulness is to some extent impaired by Leo's habit of leaving the MS. reading untouched in every case where it is the metrical blemish of Hiatus which shows the reading to be corrupt. That *Plautus* did not write the line with Hiatus Leo readily admits; but he holds that it probably appeared in this form in that recension of the second century A.D. of

which he believes both the Ambrosian Palimpsest and the proto-archetype of our other MSS. to be copies. This theory of the history of our manuscript tradition has (to my mind, unfortunately) induced him to leave every line of the kind in its corrupt form, with the addition of an ictus-sign to indicate the Hiatus. Had he confined this practice to lines which had the same unmetrical form in the Palimpsest as in the minuscule MSS., there would not be the same ground for objection. But he has pushed the theory to its farthest limits by extending the same treatment to the host of lines for which we have only the evidence of the minuscule MSS. Now the passages preserved in the Palimpsest constitute the smaller portion of the writings of *Plautus*. For all the rest our manuscript authority is in reality nothing more than the text of a single lost minuscule MS. of Charlemagne's time or later, the immediate archetype of our existing MSS., and even its text has not been preserved to us unaltered. A single instance will show the weak point of Leo's system. It is well known that it was the practice of Carolingian scribes, in obedience to their text-books of orthography, to change O. Lat. *illi* 'there' to *illic* and O. Lat. *illic* 'to him' to *illi*. Leo himself readily removes the scribe's correction in a line like *Capt.* 278, where the MSS. with their *illic* 'there' give the line a syllable too many:

quód genus illi est únúm pollens átque honoratissumum.

But in a precisely similar case, *Amph.* 263, where the *illi* 'to him' of the MSS. leaves a Hiatus in the line, he prints the line in its corrupt form, contenting himself with mentioning the emendation in the critical apparatus. Few of his readers, I fancy, will thank him for not doing as other editors do, who print:

áttat illic húc iturust. íbo ego illic óbviám.

Where the corruption has to be remedied by the withdrawal of a syllable, the emendation is made by Leo and, as a rule, excellently made. But where it is the addition of a syllable that is required, to remove Hiatus, the line is allowed to stand in its corrupt form with a troublesome obelus or its equivalent. Of course, mediaeval scribes erred as frequently by omitting a syllable or letter as by inserting one, so that the number of lines with this corruption is a large one;

and Leo's practice has seriously affected his presentation of the text. It is a thousand pities that he ever adopted this plan.

In the Introduction Leo confesses frankly that he has not collated the MSS. for himself, but has used the critical apparatus of the larger Leipzig edition: *aliud est apparatus criticum comparare, aliud scriptoris opus recensere et emendare*; in Plauto *utrumque facere mortalitas non concedit uni*. That is a statement to which those who have given attention to Plautus cannot but assent, as they will sympathize with the complaint, which he makes a little further on, of the difficulty of ascertaining whether one's conjectural emendations of Plautine lines have not been made before by some one else. Still an editor must always pay the penalty, be it great or be it small, for not having made himself familiar with the MSS. of his author. In *Curc.* 101, for example, Leo is wrong in making B^2 an authority for *nautea*. The suprascript *t* over *nausea* in B is in Camera-rius' handwriting, so that *nautea* has no authority from the MSS. of Plautus; *Capt.* 433-44, 472-9, 516-23 are not 'omitted' by O , as Leo says, but have been cut off by the binder. In *Capt.* 516 *nemo* was probably the reading of B^1 also, and in *Aul.* 560 it seemed to me that the original reading in B was *obsequium* or something of the kind, so that B^1 practically agreed with the other MSS. which have *obsequium*. The critical note on *Capt.* 521 should be: Ne *BEV*, Nec *J*; on *Cist.* 668: *ais... B^1*, *ais há B^2* (with the apex sign indicating a long vowel); on *Asin.* 19: *tu sup. scr. B* (not *BD*), and so on.

With Leo's account of the relation of the MSS. to one another I cannot altogether agree. The few readings which we have from the lost MS. of Turnebus are not sufficient to prove that it came from another archetype than *BCD*. And it is hardly right to say that the corrections in the first part of B , useful as they are, make our text of the first eight plays more certain than our text of the last twelve; for they may very well come from the first part of the same Archetype of the second part of which B (for the last twelve plays) is a direct copy. Nor should the readings of B^1 in the first eight plays have too much weight assigned to them, when a strong combination of MSS. opposes. In *Aul.* 102, for example, *est*, omitted by D and by the group *EJ*, was probably omitted in the archetype too, and is a gratuitous insertion in B ; in *Aul.* 146 *factum volo* (which Leo ventures to scan as a Choriambus) of B should not be preferred to *facta volo* of *DEJ*; nor in

Cist. 531 *amens* of B to *amans* of B^2VEJ ; nor in *Asin.* 860 *ista vera* of B to *vera ista* of *DEJ*.

Plautine Prosody cannot yet be said to be a settled matter. In particular the exact limitations of the Law of Breves Breviantes are open to discussion. The extreme application of the Law so as to allow the shortening of each and every syllable, whether long by nature or by position, whether accented or unaccented, I must confess I do not regard as worthy of discussion, and I am glad to see that Leo is of the same opinion; and also that he recognizes the part played by accent in Plautine metre (see, for example, his note on *Bacch.* 669). His text is not disfigured by a scansion¹ like *amica* in *Stich.* 696:

'*Amica*,' uter utrubi accumbamus? Abi tu sane superior.

But until the few examples offered by the MSS. of scansions like *amicítia*, *ágrôs*, *áquäs* have been either satisfactorily removed or satisfactorily established, it must remain an open question whether we should say that Plautus 'never allows,' or rather that he 'is averse to,' the shortening of an unaccented vowel that is (1) long by position, (2) preceded by a Mute and Liquid, (3) preceded by *qu* (in the case of all vowels except *o* and *u*). Leo refuses *amicítia*, but accepts *ágrôs*, *áquäs*. I doubt all three. It is in any case the safer policy to avoid these questionable scansions in conjectural emendations (e.g. *probrô das* of Leo in *Rud.* 733). But I cannot share his objection to *miles Aul.* 528, which in Plautus' time seem to have retained the trace of the double consonant, *miless*; nor again his acceptance of *ill(a)* beside *ill(e)* (e.g. *Trin.* 809 *lepidást ill(a) causa*, ut *commemoravi*, *dicere*), for *illá* was the pronunciation in vogue not so very long before Plautus' time. And I greatly doubt the possibility of *Ecthlipsis* like *opt(u)lit Aul.* 722, *perd(i)tissimus² Aul.* 723 (first word of the line). A third Singular Perf. Ind. in *-aut* for *-avit* like *adnumeraut* in *Asin.* 501 is not justified by forms like *exít* for *exivit*, etc., for while the reduction of *exívit* to *exít* is

¹ A scansion like this I can only characterize by a line constructed after the same model:

Prósódiam quam péródit Musa, inámœnam, pérhór-ridam, inútilem!

² The next line begins with *perdidi*, which may easily have perverted the form of the Superlative. *Pessumus* has been proposed. I have also thought of *peritissimus*, from a possible *peritus* (like *subitus*) from *perco* (cf. *puppis pereunda est probe Epil.* 74).

supported by instances like *dīnus* for *dīvīnus* etc., we have no parallel instance of *-āvi-* becoming *-au-* or *-ā-*; and *-vit* 3 Sg. Perf. had a long vowel in Plautus' time. Leo's theory that final *s* after a short vowel might be elided before an initial vowel in Plautus has led him astray in *Rud.* 887-8:

illic in columbum, credo, leno vortitur,
nam collus in columbari haud multo post
erit.

Here the minuscule MSS. (the evidence of the Palimpsest is wanting) read *in columbari collum*, a transposition easily explained by the *in columbum* of the line above. *Collum* is of course inadmissible, for *collus* is the only form known in early Latin and is expressly attested for this line by Priscian. But Leo retains the order of the words in the MSS., making the last syllable of *collus* elided before *haud* and supposing Plautus for the sake of the pun to have changed the normal form *columbar* (a kind of stocks, 'pigeon-hole' stocks) to *collumbar*, a very unlikely supposition. (Transposition of words which have the same order both in the Ambrosian and the minuscule MSS. is another matter. I would not change *me ita* of *Poen.* 1258 (AP) to *ita me*, as Leo has done.)

Other points that I have noted are: *Aul.* 299 the lost line probably ended in *existumat* and its loss was due to Homoeoteleuton; 406 *pt* is a Late Latin misspelling of *tt*: e.g. *attatae* of *Cas.* 468 is miswritten *aptate* in *E.* Has a similar corruption produced *optati* in this line? The line may have begun with *plat(a)i* or *ptatae* in the Archetype, with the initial not supplied by the 'rubricator'; *Bacch.* 988* the recurrence of *ut quod jubeo facias* in vv. 990, 993 is no reason for removing the words from this line. The joke lay in the iteration of the phrase; *Capt.* 201 in the *Captivi* we find examples of *aio* (written with the 'high-backed' form of *a*) confused with *dico* (written *dio* with contraction-line above), e.g. vv. 72, 694. The *ditis* or *clitis* of the MSS. here may be from *aitis*, and the true form of the lines something of this kind:

Elulatiōne haud opus est:
Multa oculis muti mira ait is;

204 is not *vinclum* the Plautine form?; *Cas.* prol. 7, 13 in this post-Plautine prologue the archaism *anticua*, *anticuam* is possible, and even in v. 23 *aēs*; *Curc.* 124 how does Leo scan this line?; 316 *ventum* from *vento-lo* is

NO. XC. VOL. X.

as inadmissible as *circlos* from *circo-lo* in Accius 100 R. (read *circos*); *Epid.* 19 the Palatine Archetype seems to have had *utillivispon* followed by a lacuna, the *respondi* of *B²* being as gratuitous a conjecture as the *respondit* of *E²*. There is therefore no MS. authority for bringing the Verb *respondeo* into the line; *Men.* 105 *domari* (cf. *urant Capt.* 84) seems the most likely form of the Verb, and *domatus* would be readily changed by a mediaeval scribe to *domitus* (from *domo*, I subdue); *Men.* 1042 the peculiarities of this passage in *A* and *P* may be explained if we suppose it to have originally run like this:

etiam hic seruom se meum aiebat, quem ego
modo emisi manu,
(?) ille qui se petere modo argentum, modo
qui suom me erum,
seruom se meum esse aiebat, quem ego
modo emisi manu:
is ait se mihi, etc.,

and the omissions in *A* and *P* to have been caused by the Homoeoteleuton; *Merc.* 138 (cf. *Poen.* 540) the Archetype too of our Nonius MSS. probably had *ramites*, for this is the spelling throughout the passage in the first hand of the Leyden MS., our best guide in matters of orthography; *Mil.* 100 *matre* is easily explained as an expansion of the supposed contraction *me*. Read:

is amabat meretricem ex (written *ē* in the Archetype) Athenis Atticis;

1006 *celocla* from *celōc-lā-* should be the Plautine form, so retain *illa* after *autem*; 1060 *porclena* from *porco-* is doubtful. Why not *procul-* (cf. *Phrygio, tarpezita*) with the MSS.? *Most.* 926 *eam dis gratiam* (sc. habeo) is closer to the MSS. (bis *A*, de his *P*; cf. *Most.* 563 *de his* for *dis P*); *Pers.* 190 *sed ita volo te: curre ut etc.* (*currere A, curare P*); *Pers.* 265 surely Sagaristio is boasting of his '*homines domiti*' in contrast to *boves domiti*. Read with *P*:

nunc amico hominibus domitis mea ex
crumina largiar (*hominibibus A*);

Most. 1172 supply *men istum?* after *istum*, 'Forgive that slave of yours. I forgive that protégé of yours!'; *Poen.* 690 cf. *μυχοῦς ἀνδρείον καὶ γυναικείον μύριον* Hesych.; 778 there is MS. evidence for *arvio* (cf. *Phrygio* for *Phrygio Aul.* 508); 1290 *atritus* is a likely O. Lat. form and seems expressly attested by Paulus (*leg. atritus: atri*

A A

coloris); so read *a'ritior* here with *A*, not *atrior* with *P*; *Pseud.* 593 I think *māchaera* was the Plautine pronunciation; 1205-7 the reason why those lines are written also after v. 1161 (at an interval of 42 lines) in *P* is that the scribe of the Archetype, in copying the proto-Archetype (which had 21 lines on a page and 42 on a leaf), turned over a leaf too many and did not discover his mistake till he had written the first two lines of the wrong leaf; *Trin.* 888 I doubt the explanation of *vicillum* of the MSS. as a diminutive noun formed from *vix*. *Vicillum* is a common form of *vecillum* on late inscriptions (e.g. *C.I.L.* vi. 1377, c. 180 A.D.). Can *vecillum* have had in Plautus' time the sense of 'a holder,' a vessel for holding liquid?; 1130 *proprius* (from *pro* and *privus*) may have had $\frac{1}{2}$ like *illius* etc. The form *proprius* suits this line, also *Capt.* 862, *Merc.* 338; 1021 the explanation of *oculicrepidæ* by reference to *Anon. Vales.* 14, 87 *accepta chorda in fronte diutissime tortus ita est, ut oculi ejus creparent*, is far-fetched and should not have been accepted; *Truc.* 231 *nec umquam quisquam* (with the sentence-accent on *quisquam*) is supported by v. 240 *nec umquam ulla*, but does not involve the acceptance of *necumquam*, *necullus* as Plautine forms of *numquam*, *nullus*; 583 the *aca* of *B* for *accepta* here throws light on the puzzling *iteca* of v. 51 *res perit iteica in aedibus lenonis (lenoniis)*. It was a contraction for *intercepta*; 615 surely the line is trochaic like other lines of this passage; 675 *osculentiam* (so the

MSS.) for *obsequentiam* is exactly the kind of word we should expect from 'Truculentus,' the Mrs. Malaprop of Latin Comedy; 680 I cannot help thinking that *parasitus* is a comical name for a bag or scrip, here a money-bag (cf. *Stich.* 231); 691 why not keep the 'rustic' Latin form *conea* with the MSS. and *Probus*?; 877 is there much more reason for changing *refacere* here than for changing *recharmida* in *Trin.* 977?; 906 can the *purus* of the MSS. preserve a possible O. Lat. form of *puer* (cf. *socerus Men.* 957)? *Puerus est totum diem* will mean 'a boy is eating the live-long day'; 842 why has Prof. Palmer's emendation not been accepted, *Eam dem! pol.* etc.? Of misprints I have noted: *Asin.* 579 *vinginti*: p. 139 heading BACCIHDES: *Aul.* 468 *cirum*: *Bacch.* 1145 *nostras*: *Mil.* 152 crit. *om. P* for *om. A*.

The two volumes show a veritable *embarras de richesse* in felicitous emendations of the text and elucidations of Plautus' meaning. To mention all is impossible, but it is unfair to Prof. Leo to pass them over in silence. I will content myself with specifying from the last plays the emendations in *Trin.* 406, *Rud.* 1314, 829, and the explanations of *flector Truc.* 343, *continet Stich.* 452. Nor can I omit to mention how much has been done in this edition towards the restoration of the Plautine Cantica, all through keeping more closely than previous editions to the MSS.

W. M. LINDSAY.

THE BERLIN PAPYRI.

Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin, herausgegeben von der Generalverwaltung. Griechische Urkunden. Erster Band, Hefte 4-12; zweiter Band, Hefte 1-6. (Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1893-1896.) Each Mk. 2.40.

The publication of the Berlin Papyri has proceeded, if hardly with the rapidity that was promised at the time of its commencement in 1892, at any rate with commendable regularity. Since the simultaneous issue of the initial three numbers in that year, the first volume has been completed in twelve parts, the last containing copious indices, some long lists of *errata*, and a couple of

photographic plates; and of the second volume six parts have already made their appearance. In all there have now been published 551¹ papyri—but a fraction, we are told, of what remains—varying widely in character, ranging in length from a few words to several hundreds of lines, and in date from the reign of the first Caesar to far into the seventh century. The general nature of their contents is too well known to need much specification here. Official decrees and injunctions, protocols and accounts of legal proceedings, tax and census returns, tax-receipts, leases, sales,

¹ Since these lines were written three more parts have been added, carrying the total to 627. These I hope to notice on another occasion. A.S.H.

accounts of expenditure and receipts for amounts expended, petitions and letters, succeed each other in almost overwhelming profusion. Every now and then the appetite is whetted and the imagination again set wondering what treasures the sands of Egypt may yet have in store for us, by relics of such interest as, for instance, the different imperial rescripts—No. 74, of Marcus and Verus, No. 140, of Trajan, No. 267, of Septimius Severus, No. 473, of the same emperor and Caracalla; or the *libellus*, the declaration of paganism by a suspected Christian, of the year 250 (No. 287); or again the, unfortunately fragmentary, account of the proceedings of an anti-Semitic embassy from Alexandria before the emperor Claudius (No. 511)—a parallel to the famous *legatio ad Caicum* so graphically described by Philo. Exhaustive monographs on these and others of the more important texts are to be found in the pages of the German periodicals. The interest of the last-mentioned embassy to Claudius has been much increased by the recent discovery at the Gizeh Museum of the continuation of the same document. The whole has been ably published and commented upon by M. Theodore Reinach (*Revue des Études Juives*, xxxi. 62). It is true that the papyri of this class are not common; but though the majority of the texts may individually seem small in comparison, collectively they contain a mine of information for the history of the internal administration of a province, and of the everyday life of a people.

In spite of some adverse criticism upon the form of their publication, the editors have consistently adhered to their original plan of confining themselves to the reproduction of the bare texts, unadorned save for the addition of a few data as to *provenance*, measurement, age, etc., of the original, and the resolution of symbols and abbreviations. To have supplemented this by, let us say, brief summaries of contents and occasional explanatory footnotes would certainly have enhanced the general value of the publication, and rendered its use considerably easier to the specialist, without adding much either to its bulk or expense. The want is the more felt as no system is observed in the distribution of the texts, which has no reference either to subject or chronology. Ultimately no doubt these deficiencies have, in the case of the first volume, been largely supplied by the admirable indices which close it. But they of course cover this volume only; and there

seems to be no immediate prospect of more. The editors would be rendering the student a great service if they could see their way to a rather more frequent issue of indices—for it is here that in its present form much of the value of their work lies. A classification of the papyri according to subject is another great *desideratum*.

The main object, of course, which has from the first been kept in view, is the rapid production of as many satisfactory texts as possible. On the success with which this end is achieved the authors are to be sincerely congratulated. In dealing with hands which are as difficult as many of these are, it is inevitable that inaccuracies and misreadings should occasionally occur. Of the errors to which even the most skilled palaeographer is liable the lists of *Berichtigungen und Nachträge* afford sufficient testimony. But that the maximum of accuracy has here been attained the reader would be led to expect from the care taken with the printed text; and the expectation is amply confirmed by a comparison with the originals. Among minor, chiefly orthographic, errors the following may be mentioned. No. 156, l. 2, the first ι in $\tau\rho\alpha\pi\epsilon\acute{\zeta}\iota\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$ only should be included within the bracket. In l. 5 the papyrus reads Ηρακλίδου not Ηρακλείδου . Πανεφρόμμις not Πανεφρέμμις is the name in No. 184, ll. 21 and 22. No. 194, l. 14, the termination $\sigma\upsilon$ in $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ has in both words been corrected from ω . In l. 17 the scribe included $\alpha\pi\omicron$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ in round brackets; and in l. 26 the horizontal stroke over $\epsilon\eta$ has been overlooked. In No. 255 the editor has omitted several of the lection signs—the single dot over ν in $\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma$, ll. 4 (twice) and 5, and $\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\nu$ l. 6; and the stroke like a large soft breathing which is placed over the first letter in $\epsilon\mu\omega\acute{\nu}$ and $\epsilon\mu(\acute{\alpha}\varsigma)$ ll. 4, 6, and 9, and $\epsilon\pi\kappa\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon(\nu\omicron\nu)$, l. 6. The sign is sometimes met with turned in the opposite direction; e.g. over the initial ν of $\epsilon\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho[\omicron\upsilon]$, No. 364, l. 6, and of $\epsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ ll. 13 and 16. In l. 19 $\delta\sigma\omega\varsigma$ seems to have been written in place of the usual $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$. Similarly in No. 287 read $\delta\phi\rho\acute{\upsilon}$ (l. 6) and Ἰ[ε]ρείων (l. 12). No. 295, l. 3 $\eta\mu\acute{\omega}(\nu)$ and l. 11 $\sigma\omicron\tau\alpha\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\omega}(\nu)$ should be read. In No. 303, l. 15 $\epsilon\kappa\eta\varsigma$ $\iota\nu(\delta\iota\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma)$ for $\epsilon\kappa\tau\eta[\varsigma]$ $\iota\text{νδ}\iota\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$ is a curious slip. In l. 20 Ἐπιφ and in l. 21 Αἰρηλ(ιος) would be more correct. Compare Ἀρσιν(ὸ)η instead of Αρσ(ιν)ὸ)η , No. 387, l. 5. Similar small oversights are the omission in No. 305 of the points in $\epsilon\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ (l. 1), Παῖνι (l. 2), and Ἀρσινοῖτων (l. 4), and the reading $\delta\mu\phi\omicron(\nu)$ for $\delta\mu\phi\omicron\upsilon$ (l. 7). The word Παῖνι is similarly

written in the original of No. 314, l. 20; in l. 17 of the same document the ν of $\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ is written above the line, not omitted. The dot separating the two sigmas of the words $\pi\rho\acute{o}s\ \sigma\acute{\iota}$ in No. 317, l. 5 has not been noticed. In No. 365, l. 3 read $[\delta]εσποίν(ης)$: it should also have been noted that a second hand begins at l. 9. It is interesting to find that in No. 369, l. 2 $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ and not $\acute{\epsilon}\nu'$ is certainly written. Unless an equally clear case of $\acute{\epsilon}\nu'$ is forthcoming, this instance seems to decide the question between the alternatives in the formula under question. $\Sigma\nu\nu\pi\epsilon\phi\omega\nu\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\varsigma$ not $\sigma\upsilon\nu\mu\pi\epsilon\phi\omega\nu\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\varsigma$ in No. 373, l. 8 is the reading of the papyrus. In No. 379, l. 18 $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ is the correct spelling. The first name in No. 408, l. 21 has been spelt $\Lambda\kappa\iota\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ by the scribe. This list, which might be extended, will serve to show the kind of inadvertences which are most inevitable. I do not mention instances where I should disagree with the editor in his marking of doubtful letters, or his use of the square bracket. I should however like to remark in passing how much it is to be regretted that editors of papyri in general have not yet adopted any uniform system for the textual representation of partially lost or indistinct letters. The plan, now becoming common, of printing dots underneath the line as marks of uncertainty is an excellent one—there are still, however, some eminent dissentients. But it remains to be determined what constitutes uncertainty. In the frequent case, for instance, where a letter is partially obliterated, but enough of it still remains to decide, with the aid of the context, what it really was, one editor will print it without comment, another will condemn it to the dot of doubt, and a third will include it in a bracket. There should be some distinction in the treatment of such letters and those that are really dubious. Very arbitrary too is apt to be the judgment, in cases in which rubbing or fading has occurred, where the brackets are to begin, and the dots signifying visible but illegible letters to cease. The bracket of course saves trouble; but its indiscriminate use is not fair to the conjecturer.

But it is perhaps premature to discuss such details—where too a large allowance has always to be made for the 'personal equation'—when uniformity has not yet been reached on the larger question of the form in which the text is to be presented. In the present case accents, breathings, and iota subscripts are printed in full, and abbreviations re-extended in brackets.

Others prefer to print the text exactly as it stands and to explain it by means of translations and footnotes. The latest example of this plan is the recent volume of the *Corpus Papyrorum Raineri*. The objection to it is that it renders perusal needlessly difficult and unpleasant; and the transcriber may often fail to make it clear how he really understood a passage. Against the rival method it may be urged that it is less scientific; and that although the actually written signs may be also printed, they become obscured—and, it might be added, tend to be omitted, as I have endeavoured to make apparent above. It is, in fact, but a compromise between the opposed systems of faithful reproduction and complete modernization. It is not true that the pages of the Berlin *Griechische Urkunden* have, as M. J. Nicole, in the introduction to his recent first instalment of the Geneva papyri, claims, 'la physionomie toute moderne qui les assimile entièrement à celui de nos livres.' Who could look at the first page and maintain this assertion? It is indeed somewhat remarkable that such an absolute concession to the 'general reader' should have found so little favour. Is it such a crime to alter the 'aspect of the texts of papyri,' or to emend their orthography? Is it not more important to render them as attractive and readable as possible? Signs and abbreviations, which after all, as soon as they are once explained, are of interest to the palaeographer only, could be reproduced at the bottom of the page. At all events, the mixture of modern and antique uses can hardly be termed satisfactory.

It is but seldom that revision produces corrections of an at all serious nature. The following may be instanced:—

No. 155, l. 11-13, read $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\chi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron$ | ν $\tau\acute{o}\kappa\omega\nu$
κα[1]
καὶ τῆς ὑποθήκης τὸν α | ἀνὰ (sic).

No. 156, l. 10. The emperor's name should run $\Sigma\epsilon\pi\tau\iota\mu\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ $\Sigma\epsilon\upsilon\eta\acute{\rho}\omicron\nu$ $\text{Ἐν}[\sigma\epsilon\beta]\omicron\delta\acute{\varsigma}$ $\Pi\epsilon\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma$.

The latter half of l. 5 I read $\acute{\alpha}\rho\upsilon\sigma\iota\omega\nu$ $\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ [ῆ]μιν $\acute{\alpha}\mu\pi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ where the editor has given $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\omega\varsigma\epsilon\nu$...

No. 174, verso: $\chi\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\varsigma$.

No. 181, l. 16 $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ for $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\omega}$ [ι].

No. 189, l. 8 read $\delta\rho\alpha\chi\mu\acute{\eta}$ $\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha$ $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\beta\omicron\upsilon$ [λο]ν $\tau\eta$ $\mu\upsilon\acute{\alpha}$.

In l. 4 $\delta\acute{\alpha}$ [ν]ηον not $\delta\acute{\alpha}$ [ν]ειον was written.

No. 196, l. 19 $\tau\acute{\omega}\upsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\omicron\nu$ for $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\iota\tau\omicron\nu$ $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\omega\nu$.

No. 197, l. 9 $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\iota\nu$ $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\nu'$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\iota\nu$ $\tau\acute{\alpha}$.

In l. 16 $\tau\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\varsigma$ $\tau\epsilon$ $\chi\omega\mu\alpha\tau\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ [...] is perhaps

the true reading. In l. 10 ὅσον ἐὰν ἦ... in accordance with the usual formula, is certainly right.

No. 199, l. 11, I would suggest Πακῶσις for the lacuna; l. 5 of the *verso* begins with the sign for δραχμαί.

No. 275, l. 4, read ἰς (= εἰς) τὴν for ἐκ τῆς; cf. the similar phrase in No. 46, l. 7.

No. 286, ll. 3 and 4, I should prefer Αἰρίλιος and Αἰρίλιω.

No. 312, Fr. 2, l. 2, the lacuna may be filled up [μετὰ παντὸς αὐτοῦ] [τοῦ] δικ[αιω](ῶ) ἐφ' ὅσον.

l. 11 [μαρτυρῶ τῇ μισθώσ]ε[ι] ὅς (= ὅς) πρό(κειται).

No. 317, l. 11, read χρεωστῆς for χρεῶν εἰς. The verb is not uncommon in papyri of the period.

No. 339, l. 11 τετ[τ]ερα[σκαῖδεκα] (?) for πεντε[αῖδεκα]. Similarly in l. 30 [τεττ]ερασ[καῖδεκα] (?).

No. 379, ll. 20 ff. may be emended:—

καθ' ἣν πεποιήνται τε[ρ]ι | τ[δ]

α (sic)
τρίτ[ον] μέρος τῆς τοῦ κλήρου ἀρ[ούρ]η[ς] μῆς τ[ῆς] | ὑπ' οὐδενὸς κρατουμένης γενέ<ι>σθω ὡς καθήκει.

No. 389, ll. 8 and 9, I read:

φα[γεῖν] τὴν ἐκθραν (sic) καὶ παρανο | [μῖαν...].

No. 390, l. 11, τοῦτοῖς should be added after κεφαλαίους.

No. 401, l. 15, read συνομειλῶν for συνομέχων.

In l. 1 the papyrus has the contraction Χῦ.

No. 409, l. 1, Φαησίον for Φαήσιος.

l. 8, instead of μοι either μου or μαι (= μοι) should be read; for the former cf. l. 17, for the latter, No. 424, l. 12, where the scribe wrote μαι not μοι.

No. 421, ll. 4-5, read πέπ[ρα]κα | ἐν(ι) τ[ῷ] for πέν[τε] πέπ[ρα] | κα τ[ῷ].

ll. 15 and 16, [τοῦ ἐν | εσ]τώτως is obvious.

No. 450, l. 8, ὅτε γὰρ ἦν seems to begin the new sentence.

No. 456, *verso*, [Πρῶσις(?) φοινί]κων δύο.

No. 459, l. 12, ? περικελλί[ο]ν. In the previous line the letters look more like τέταρτον than πέμπτον.

No. 467, l. 7, τό[τε] πε[ρὶ] σ...[.].[.]. ἐμοὶ would help to mend the lacuna.

No. 472, l. 11, τριάκοντα πέντε seems to be clearly written, though this does not square with col. ii. l. 7.

I proceed to add a few conjectures not based on a personal examination of the originals.

No. 92, l. 18, στρ(ατηγῶ) seems to be a

misreading for ἐγρ(άφη). στρ(ατηγῶ) is difficult in this position, while ἐγρ(άφη), which would be written in a very similar way, yields a natural sense. Moreover the same formula occurs in a papyrus in Mr. B. P. Grenfell's collection, and here the word ἐγράφη is written out in full.

Another papyrus belonging to Mr. Grenfell proves that Zoilus was the βασιλικὸς γραμματεὺς of the Heraclid μερίς in the year 162/3, thus fixing more exactly the date of No. 89. The same document shows that Συριακός is the second name of the Ἄννιος of No. 198, l. 6. To papyri from the same source I owe the restoration of Κρηνολήφ as the first name of the Quintilianus in No. 98, l. 1; and the conjecture that l. 20 of No. 352 contains the rest of the date, *e.g.*

Ἀδριανοῦ Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου Μεχ(είρ) γ.

This emendation is based on the actual document referred to in No. 352, ll. 7 ff. If it is right, the distinction made by Dr. Krebs between the third and fourth hands must be imaginary.—The name in l. 21 is probably Πτολεμαῖος.

A better preserved parallel to No. 109, relating to the ἐπὶκρισις or official examination of youths prior to conscription (cf. also 'Les papyrus de Genève,' vol. I. Fasc. I. No. 18), serves to fill up many of the lacunae which disfigure the Berlin papyrus. The following suggested restorations, unless otherwise specified, refer to the commencements of the lines:—

l. 5. [Μύσθον ἀμποτέρων]

l. 10. *end.* ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν

l. 11. [ὁ Μύσθης ἀπεγρ(αψάμην)]

l. 12. [κατ' οἰκίαν ἀπογραφαί]ς

l. 13. [καὶ ἡ γυνή μου]

l. 16. [καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου]

l. 17. *end.* ἐπικρινόμενον ἡμῶν (or ἐξ ἀλλήλ(ων)) νῖόν

l. 18. [Πτολεμαῖον. οἱ δὲ]

l. 19. [ἀπεγρ(άφησαν) εἰς κ.τ.λ.]

Some obscurity still attaches to the construction of ll. 15—17. Further on, Ἀράβ[ω]ι is perhaps the name of the ἀμφοδον which is clearly to be looked for at the beginning of l. 20. If the orthography of our papyrus may be relied upon, Ἀράβ[ω]ι or Ἀράβ[ω] is also to be read for Ἀράβ[ων] in No. 254 ll. 10 and 14.

There is some difficulty about the age at which youths had to be sent up for this ἐπὶκρισις. In No. 109 l. 7, Dr. Wilcken (Heft 12, Berichtigungen) reads the numeral as γ, and this is supported by the parallel passage in the Geneva papyrus already mentioned. In the document before me, on the other hand, it is quite certainly δ;

while in No. 324 of the Berlin collection, where the examinees are two slaves, their ages are respectively fourteen and eleven years. If the readings in all these places are correct, the age could vary at any rate within certain limits.—Texts of these and numerous other new papyri will be published by Mr. Grenfell and myself in a short time.

A papyrus found on the site of the ancient Bacchias by Mr. D. G. Hogarth and Mr. Grenfell last winter throws some doubt on the reading *προχρεία* in the numerous documents described in Dr. Viereck's monograph as 'Quittungen über Lieferung von Saatkorn' (*Hermes*, xxx. p. 107 ff). These are perhaps the complement of the other numerous class characterized by the formula *μεμετρήμεθα*, Nos. 188 and 336. In the one the board of *σιτολόγοι* certifies the assignment of corn of which in the other the *γεωργός* acknowledges the loan. No. 279 differs from the remaining receipts, of which Nos. 104 and 105 may be taken as specimens, in reading in the place of *προ(χρεία)* what the editor has transcribed as *προσ | φώ(νησιν)*, and Dr. Viereck as *προσ | φω(ράν)*. This he thinks (*l.c.* p. 111) must be either a mistake for *προχρεία*, or else read as *προσ-φωράν*. The new Bacchias papyrus has, in a similar context, quite clearly *προφω*. It is perhaps admissible, in dealing with a single instance, to postulate a clerical error. A second independent case—the papyrus in question is older than No. 279 by seventeen years—quite changes the aspect of the matter. It may be conjectured that in the Berlin document *προ | φω* is also to be read. What Dr. Krebs transcribed as *σ* may not be more than a connecting stroke. And it is difficult to see what the intended word can be if not *προφώνησιν*. The question then arises whether, in the absence of further evidence, the same word should not be substituted for *προχρεία* in the cases in which the letters *προ* only have been written.

No. 264 is a specimen of an increasing class of papyri, referring to work done on the embankments of the canals which were and are so important to the Egyptian cultivator. Such documents appear to be always dated in Payni, Epeiph, or (more rarely) Mesore, the summer months when the Nile was rising or in flood. It was naturally at this period that the state of the embankments demanded most attention. New parallels from Bacchias make it clear that the name of a month—doubtless either *Παῦνι* or *Επεῖφ*—is to be read in place of *μη* (l. 4), and remove any doubt about the reading *εἰ ὥς*. Five days are the regular period for work of this kind. *ἐν ὁρ(ύγματι)* may be suggested for *ετορ*. The meaning of the abbreviation in l. 5 remains doubtful.

A couple of papyri of similar *provenance* suggest a revision of the editor's not very happy interpretation of the two prayers for restoration to health, Nos. 229 and 230. By *τοῦτον μοι ἐξενικον* the suppliant almost certainly meant *τοῦτό μοι ἐξένεγκον*—'Accomplish this for me.' The previous line is either a question or a wish; *μεν* may be for *μήν*.

These are a few instances of the way in which new texts help to clear up difficulties and supplement deficiencies in old ones. The attitude of the first editor must often be tentative and hesitating; for his conclusions may be upset or modified by the next discovery. What is therefore now of chief importance is the rapid publication of all available materials. The supply shows at present no signs of failure. It is then too soon yet to go far in gathering up results and forming generalizations. The first duty of the present generation of papyrologists is to lose no time in making these possible. The Berlin editors here set an example which others would do well to follow.

A. S. HUNT.

GREENIDGE ON INFAMIA.

Infamia; its Place in Roman Public and Private Law, by A. H. J. GREENIDGE. 1894. 10s. 6d.

A MONOGRAPH of over 200 pages on a single institute of Roman law is an unusual phenomenon in English literature, and deserved earlier recognition than I have

been able to make. The subject is one which bears both on constitutional and on private law, but it is not one of law only. Judgment on conduct is none the less active and influential, because it is not always expressed by a magistrate or attended with legal or political consequences. And even where, as in Rome, the state had a special

organ—the censorship—for giving voice to the disapprobation of the community, there is scope for great variety in the subjects, the effects, and the permanence of the censure.

The most definite connexion of *infamia* with Roman private law is in the Praetor's Edict, fragments of which are found in the *Digest* (iii. titt. 1, 2). Disability to appear in court for the conduct of suits for others was the consequence of legally recognized disgrace, the disability being absolute in the cases of capital crime, of certain foul indecency, and of hiring oneself out to fight with wild beasts. But a much more numerous class were disabled from conducting suits for any but near relations and connexions: and the components of this class are mentioned in the Edict and also described as *infames*. A list of classes of persons excluded from municipal office is given in a bronze inscription at Naples which has preserved to us part of Caesar's law of about 709 A.U.C. And this list is so largely identical with the list which we have in the *Digest*, that we cannot doubt that they have a common basis in the republican law of Rome. Cicero in his speech for Cluentius discusses, no doubt with an advocate's bias, the character of the censor's mark (*nota*), and the *ignominia* thence resulting. There are further isolated instances of persons, or sometimes of classes, in some way disgraced which have to be considered. But, speaking generally, it may be said that modern discussion moves round the *Digest*, the Julian municipal law, and the censorship, especially as treated by Cicero, the questions being what was the relation of (legal) *infamia* to (censorial) *ignominia*, what were the public and definite consequences of either, and what were the conditions of their infliction.

Savigny in his own admirably clear and precise style treated this subject in his *System* vol. ii. and laid the basis for modern discussion. He held that *infamia* represented a fixed conception of the Romans, embodied in tradition and recognized as binding by the censors, who however also exercised a freer judgment over conduct in other respects: that the import of *infamia* was disability for holding public office or for exercising the suffrage; and that from this public sphere it passed into private law under the guidance of the praetor. Mommsen (*Staatsrecht* i.² p. 469) rejects this theory and holds that the word *infamis* was a general term of ordinary life, and that public opinion was variously regarded and legal importance variously given to it

by the magistrates who presided at elections and by the praetor in regulating procedure in his court. Mr. Greenidge, who is also favourably known by other writings in this *Review* and in the *Dictionary of Antiquities*, agrees generally with this view of Mommsen, and has given English students a scholarly and careful exposition of the subject in all its breadth and detail. He is familiar with both German and French treatises, and probably knows more of the subject than any one else in England. There is perhaps in this book some lack of definite grip, which has led to occasional needless repetition, and makes it not always easy to ascertain or appreciate the precise position defended. But the subject itself is somewhat slippery, and few writers are as clear in their first exposition as they would be if they had the opportunity and the patience to rewrite their book. I may be allowed to add a few short criticisms on some points.

The distinction of mediate and immediate *infamia* might well have been left with the briefest explanation and not carried through the treatise. Whether *infamia* depended on a judge's sentence, or arose *ipso facto* from a notorious fact, is of course important in the particular instance, but is a matter leading to no general consequences or inferences. On the position of the censor Mr. Greenidge avows an opposition to Savigny which is hardly justified by his own statement (p. 24). Savigny would not have denied that the censors' action in the course of time helped to create the rules of action which were felt by later censors as incumbent on them. Nor do I understand Mr. Greenidge as denying that there was a distinction, both in their own view and in that of the Roman world, between the censors' action when following invariable or usual precedent, and what I may call their individual and experimental censure on new grounds. But Mr. Greenidge looks more to the growth, Savigny more to the practical position at some point in the course. As to the disproof of the permanence of the disqualification attached to *infamia* which Mr. Greenidge (p. 25, see also p. 52) sees in the case of L. Mucius mentioned by Asconius p. 112 (and two other cases quoted in this *Review* vii. p. 30), I confess to a great reluctance to rest much on fragmentary references to cases of which we have few or no particulars, though I admit that a general adherence to such a sceptical attitude would play havoc with a good deal of so-called history of Roman institutions. However this may be, I must express my agreement with Savigny on another point, where Mr.

Greenidge declines to follow him (p. 133). I can hardly believe that in contractual actions, such as *pro socio* or *mandati* or in an action on *tutela*, condemnation necessarily caused *infamia*, irrespective of fraud. The argument of Doneau, to which Savigny refers, is I think good. But if the infamous consequence of condemnation was really absolute, then I believe there must have been some way, probably by making fraud an essential part of the issue for trial, in which mistake or slight negligence was saved from being so fatal.

What Mr. Greenidge means by quoting (p. 4 note) *facere existimatos* Gell. xiv. 7 § 8 in connexion with the meaning of *infamia* I do not understand: it appears to be entirely irrelevant. On p. 77 he suggests that *lectio senatus* meant originally the reading of the list of senators; surely far too late a use of *legere* and *lectio* (for *recitare* etc.) to be the original meaning of this old term. On p. 119 he confuses a supposed commentary by Julian on the Edict with Julian's 'redaction' of the Edict itself. On p. 120 he declines to follow Lenel and Mommsen in taking the words *hoc edicto . . . ut infames notantur* as part of Ulpian's commentary and not as part of the Edict itself. I should have thought Lenel unquestionably right. On p. 122 our author is not unnaturally perplexed by the mention of *calumnia* in Ulpian's account of the second head of the Edict, when it is found distinctly named under the third head. But the truth is we have here only an inconsequent remark of Ulpian's that condemnation in a public trial is made by a senate's decree to include *calumnia* even when committed before inferior judges. The stress is on *apud iudices pedaneos*. On p. 160 in the words 'this second list may have been wider than the first,' 'wider' is apparently a slip for 'narrower.' On p. 167 'one condemned for *repetundae*' should be 'one condemned for extortion.' There is no such nominative in this use as *repetundae*, and no crime properly so called. *Repetundarum damnatus* is a technical abridgment for *judicio pecuniarum rep. damnatus*. On p. 169 there is a somewhat strange misunderstanding of a passage of Papinian: *Existimo ergo neque jure civili testamentum valere ad quod hujusmodi testis processit neque jure praetorio quod jus civile subsequitur, ut neque hereditas adiri neque bonorum possessio dari possit*. Mr. Greenidge says 'it appears that *intestabilis* had reached the point of being understood as incapable of receiving under a testament.' This is a complete mistake. Papinian is not speaking of the disastrous

consequences to the *intestabilis* himself but to the validity or practical efficacy of any will to which such a person (*adulterii damnatus*) is a witness.

A few words upon Appendix ii. which deals with the words of the *lex Julia* disqualifying any one who in *iure abjuraverit, bonamve copiam juravit juraverit*. The clause has always puzzled me, and I regret that Mr. Greenidge has not removed my difficulties. He says *bonam copiam jurare* cannot possibly mean, what to me as to others it appears to mean, 'swore to solvency'; he translates 'who swore that they had reasonable hopes of ultimately satisfying their creditors'; and, while rejecting Huschke's connexion of the subsequent two clauses, himself connects the latter of these two clauses, disqualifying one who has made a settlement with his creditors. Perhaps we differ about the meaning of the word 'solvency.' I think persons who had property, land for instance, adequate to their debts but not at the moment convertible into cash, would generally be called solvent. And this I take to be the meaning in Varro *L.L.* vii. 105. In the *lex Julia* it is difficult to see how *bonam copiam jurare* in this, or Mr. Greenidge's not very different sense, can be a ground for inflicting disability. I am driven to the conclusion that Mommsen is wrong in supplying *bonam copiam* before *abjuraverit*. *abjurare* is nowhere used with *bonam copiam*, and is used of denying a loan in Plaut. *Curc.* 496; *Pers.* 478 *ne quis mihi in iure abjurasset*; *Rud.* 14 *qui in iure abjurant pecuniam*; Sall. *Cat.* 25 *creditum abjuraverat*: and of denying liability in Cic. *Att.* i. 8 *me sponsorem appellat: mihi autem abjurare certius est quam dependere* (this last being also a technical word). Servius on Verg. *Aen.* viii. 263 *abjurataeque rapinae* 'robberies denied on oath' says *abjurare est rem creditam negare perjurio*. I think therefore either *creditum* has been omitted in our law or *abjurare* has acquired this meaning of itself. (Since writing this I have seen that a similar view is taken by Karlowa *Rechtsgeschichte* ii. p. 598). But still we have scarcely got a satisfactory basis for disqualification. This may be found either by Huschke's method of connecting the following two clauses with it (rejecting Mommsen's supplement of *-ve*) or more probably by supposing *d. m.* for *dolo malo* omitted before *abjuraverit*.

The book is published by the Clarendon Press, and as might be expected is excellently printed.

H. J. ROBY.

MONRO'S EDITION OF TITLES OF THE *DIGEST*.

Digest xix. 2, *locati conducti*. Translated with notes by C. H. MONRO, 1891. *Digest* xlvii. 2, *de furtis*. Translated with notes by C. H. MONRO, 1893. 5s. each.

THE editions of separate titles of the *Digest* for the Cambridge University Press, which were commenced by the late Dr. Walker, have been continued by Mr. Monro. The Syndics of the Press may be congratulated on their persistence in what is probably an unprofitable undertaking, and on the much improved manner in which these two titles have been edited. Mr. Monro has brought to the task much greater knowledge of law and better scholarship than Dr. Walker did, and I think the later of his two books even shows an advance upon the former. I have read both through carefully, and though those titles were not strange to me before, I have found benefit from Mr. Monro's labour and should be very glad of the like help in other titles as well. For it must be remembered an 'edition of titles of the *Digest*' is quite a different thing from a treatise on particular parts of Roman law. There are many of the fragments which are passed over without notice in a systematic treatise, and many difficulties in the precise language and allusions of the Roman jurists, which are ignored by modern writers and are very unsatisfactorily dealt with by the older writers. If I proceed to make comments on some passages where I disagree from Mr. Monro, it is in the hope of criticism being found both more useful than generalities and not in any way incompatible with a favourable judgment on the whole. What edition of a classical author leaves no room for objection to details?

D. LOCATI CONDUCTI, l. 1. Mr. M. thinks there is a difficulty because the consensual character of *loc. cond.* is not fully recognized in *D. xix. 5 l. 5 § 2. At cum do ut facias, si tale sit factum quod locari solet, puta ut tabulam pingas, pecunia data locatio erit.* Says Mr. M. 'When the money is paid there is a *locatio*. Why not before the money is paid?' He has not caught the point. Translate 'When it is money which is transferred, we have *locatio*', and the difficulty vanishes. If it was not money, but something else, the *actio locati* does not apply; we must resort to the *actio prae-scriptis verbis*.

ll. 7, 8. I have no doubt that *ei qui* (l. 8) should not be separated, and that both denote the lessee. The middleman would

have been *sibi*. Nor do I see the difficulties which Mr. M. finds. Tryphonin rightly corrects Paul's somewhat crude dictum. A lessee is liable to his underlessee for the loss the latter sustains by eviction. *Prima facie* this loss is measured by the rent payable by underlessee to lessee, but special circumstances may make the underlessee's interest in retaining the house larger than is measured by his rent. Mr. M. refers to the final sentence of l. 33. But that fragment is dealing with evictions due to *vis major* natural or political. The position is quite different when the original lessor had a bad title. Whether he let, in knowledge or in ignorance of his title's being bad, he is liable for the whole interest of the lessee (l. 9, pr.; l. 15 § 8): and the underlessee, apart from special circumstances, can get from the lessee what the latter can get from his lessor.

l. 9 § 6. Mr. Monro is perhaps too prone to draw inferences from what is said to what is not said. Here he puts cases of purchase of the property out on lease and raises questions of notice and absence of notice. But the object of this section is very simple. A contract, whether foolish or not, binds according to its terms, and subsequent events do not affect it unless they are inconsistent with its nature or with the good faith of the parties. If a lessee acquires the ownership, by gift or legacy, of property to which his lessor had really no title, there is nothing in this to disturb his enjoyment (*frui licere*); and he has been at no cost to secure it, so that he has no claim on his landlord under the contract. Why then should he not pay rent as he covenanted? Julian tells us that he can sue, not on some other ground but on his contract (*ex conducto*), for a discharge for the future, but the contract (adds Ulpian) is good for his past occupation, and for that he must still pay any rent in arrear. Rents do not of themselves shift with the ownership (*D. xix. 1 l. 13 § 11*).

l. 13 pr. Mr. M. evidently takes this as a hire of the gig. I think it is a case of *operarum conductio*. The master of the slave *locat servum vehendum*, i.e. contracts for the conveyance of his slave: the slave is killed or hurt: and the master therefore sues the carriage-owner *ex locato*.

In § 2 *vectores* is 'passengers' not 'merchants.'

§ 4. This case, of a shoemaker striking his apprentice so violently with a last on

the neck (not 'head') that his eye was knocked out, occurs in *D. ix. 2 l. 13 pr.* with only this difference that his eye is there said *perfundi*, not *effundi*. A very competent surgeon tells me the case seems to him impossible. The only explanation which occurs to me is that the shoemaker aimed at the neck or back of the head and the lad turning round received the blow in his eye. Of course this is not accordant with the language of the report.

§ 10. The reason why the contractor, who fails to complete in time, is liable only if the work is relet on the same terms, may sometimes be, as M. Monro, following the *Basilica*, suggests, in order to test the possibility of performing the contract, though if the work be construction of some sort and partly done, no such test seems possible. But I suppose the measure of the first contractor's liability is dependent in some degree on the cost of completing the work, and for this purpose the same lines must be adhered to.

l. 15 § 7. The words *supra denique damnum seminis ad colonum pertinere declaratur* are mistranslated by Mr. M. who does not see that *supra* simply refers to § 2: 'I have said above that the loss of the seed falls on the farmer,' i.e. he cannot claim anything from the lessor on this account.

l. 19 § 3. Mr. M.'s translation is at best ambiguous. I should translate: 'If the owner in letting the property bargains to take in lieu of part of the rent a certain quantity of corn at a certain price, and afterwards refuses to take corn or to deduct any money from the rent, he can no doubt sue on the contract for the whole sum; but of course we consider it to be the duty of the judge that he should take into account the interest of the lessee to pay the excepted part of the rent in corn rather than in money.' As regards the following words *simili modo* etc. I am aware that Glück agrees with Mr. M. in understanding it of a converse right to force the lessor to take all in money with a certain addition. But I think it only means that in the case supposed the lessor can assert his right to pay part in corn by means of a direct action as well as by a plea.

ib. § 5, *deteriorem causam aedium facit*, 'makes the house dangerous to live in,' Monro. I should translate 'damages' or 'depreciates the house.' I do not think the *damni infecti cautio* here is used in the regular technical sense or is limited to the case of danger. It is simply a natural security for the landlord to require in case of alterations by the tenant.

l. 21. Mr. M. says he does not understand Javolen's answer. The explanation is this. The agreement was made by stipulation for a fixed rent. Payment of the purchase money is completed before the time in contemplation when the rent was fixed. Purchaser asks for a formal release from the stipulation (cf. *D. xlv. 4 l. 8, § 3*). If he got this, he would pay nothing; but, says Javolen, the stipulation should be enforced so far as good faith requires, i.e. the purchaser must pay a part of the rent, proportionate to the time for which he actually occupied as tenant.

l. 22 § 2. In Appendix i. Mr. M. accounts for this apparent departure from the rule given in l. 2 § 1. The rule is given better in *D. xviii. 1 l. 20*. It is not, as suggested, because in the case of buildings the remuneration for labour and skill is a larger proportion of the whole payment than in the case of a goldsmith who makes a ring from his own gold, but because the ownership of the soil carries with it the ownership of the building. In our case the *locator* clearly contracts for a building on his own ground. When I *loco insulam aedificandam* I really *conduco* the builder's services, which, as the *Digest* adds, he *locat*.

l. 30. Mr. M. is puzzled by '*pro portione quanti dominus praediorum locasset quod eius temporis habitatores habitare non potuissent rationem duci*' and I think misled by a conjecture of Mommsen that *et* should be inserted before *quod*. I have no doubt that Allen (one of the oldest of the *Digest* lawyers) has used here the old style of speech, which is found in laws and in Cicero and others (see my *Gram.* § 1297 and a very full account in Jordan's *Krit. Beitr.* p. 336 foll.). Thus the edict in *D. iv. 6 l. 1 fin.* *quod eius per leges licebit* 'so far as the laws will allow'; xxi. 1 l. 1 § 1 *quod eius praestari oportere dicatur* 'so far as it shall be said to deserve to be made good.' So here I translate 'that a calculation be made in proportion to the rent fixed by the landlord for so much of the time as the lodgers have not been able to occupy.'

l. 36. I do not see so much difficulty as Mr. M. seems to do. The rule is that a building or construction is at the risk of the contractor, until it is finished (if nothing else is said), or until approval either of the whole or of a portion, according as the agreement is *per aversionem* or *per mensuras*. But in all cases of building, etc., the loss by *vis major* falls on the locator. And why? Because he in all cases furnishes the site, to which the building is an accession: and *vis*

major as a natural phenomenon is a consequence, not of what the contractor does, but of what the *locator* supplies, viz. the site or situation. On completion or approval, the owner of the site takes over the building or the approved part of it: before that time it is understood to be the property, and therefore at the risk, of the contractor.

The words *onus aversum* and *aversio* are from different verbs *avertere* and *averrere*: *onus aversum* is 'cargo diverted from its proper destination,' i.e. made away with: *per aversionem* is 'at a sweep,' as opposed to taking bit by bit.

D. DE FURTIS, l. 1, § 3. Mr. Monro in his first appendix discusses well the two modes in which the definition may be translated. I do not believe in such a combination as *contractatio usûs*; and think the change of *lucri faciendi gratia* into *l. faciendae gratia* so easy that I have no hesitation in preferring the second interpretation. Tribonian with all his merits was in too great a hurry to care for the small points of grammar.

l. 7 pr. Mr. M. misses the point in *origo furti*, etc., and mistranslates accordingly. A slave steals something: he is not caught until after manumission. Is it theft manifest? No, says Pomponius, because the detection was not immediate. When the theft was committed, it was the act of a slave, and as such he could not be sued. His manumission altered this; and, as he was caught with the stolen goods, he might have been a thief manifest, had this been the first act. 'But the commencement of the theft was not a commencement of theft manifest.' This is simply the application of l. 6 to a case where, owing to the change of status, it might have been thought by some that a fresh commencement was made.

l. 13. Mr. M. translates 'if it is stolen at a time when you can say, etc.' I doubt this translation, and think that, had it been intended to lay stress on the time, Paul would have used *eo tempore quo* or *posteaquam* or something of that kind. '*cum stetisset*' is merely 'seeing that it was the debtor's fault' or 'its being the debtor's fault.' But my main objection is that at no time would the stipulator have had such an interest as would entitle him to bring an *actio furti*. His remedy is on the contract: he has no hold over, and therefore no legal interest in, the thing itself. See l. 86, where Mr. M.'s note is mistaken, as also on l. 14, § 10.

l. 14, § 5, § 7. In both these sections Mr. M. calls attention to the difficulty arising from the fact that, in the ordinary case of

theft by a stranger, the unit of calculation for damages claimed is not the amount of the debt for which the slave is pledged, but the value of the slave himself, the creditor however having to account for all excess over the debt. Yet it is clear that it is the debt which is divided in § 5, and that *totum* in § 7 is the debt also. I do not think that the solution is to be found in supposing, as Mr. M. does, that both cases refer only to thefts by the debtor. The creditor has a right to sue for the theft, only if he has an interest, and the amount of such interest would, I suppose, have to be shown in the course of the proceedings. His effective interest in ordinary cases is simply the amount of the debt, and whatever he gets by his action is liable (if there is no additional claim for expenses, etc.) to be cut down to this in account with the debtor. And when, as in this section, he is spoken of as having an action for so much, it is not the damages themselves which are regarded but that portion of them which the creditor will be able to retain. Both slaves being pledged for the whole debt, if one slave be lost, neither the defendant can object that the creditor has no interest, because there is another slave still in pledge who is worth the whole amount (else why was the other pledged?), nor can the debtor, when the account is taken, say that the creditor must restrict himself to one half the debt.

In § 7 you must allocate your debt in some proportion to the two slaves, if you are going to sue the thief on both heads; else, if you put the whole on one, you have no case on the other. But there is no reason for treating a thief with any greater consideration, because the thing stolen was in pledge. He is liable for the whole value: the distribution of the proceeds is a matter to be settled between the creditor and the debtor, whose joint rights cover the whole value of the slave. When the thief is the debtor himself, he has really stolen only that part of the slave which is equivalent to the creditor's claim; the rest is his own property. And the penal character of the action is satisfied by his being obliged to forfeit this amount, and not being allowed to set it off against his debt (h. t. l. 80, l. 88; xiii. 7, l. 22 pr.).

l. 21, § 4. The difficulty about the words '*si vere fuit*' seems to me to be solved by the assumption that the handle was only soldered to the cup. In this case, no doubt, the owner of the cup can vindicate it, handle and all, from third parties and truly call it his own as a whole. But the owner of the handle

can sue him *ad exhibendum* and thus regain his property. Paul in *D. vi. 1, l. 23, § 5* uses *dominus* of a handle in such a condition, and *vere fuit* means no more. He is owner but cannot for the time vindicate. If the handle were ferruminated, the case were different: the handle is for ever part of the cup, and even if separated does not revert to its former owner (*ib.*, cf. also *xli. 1, l. 27, § 2*).

l. 31. This law appears to have puzzled Mr. M. and yet I suppose he has referred to *D. iii. 4* though his reference is wrong. I have no doubt that *de ceteris rebus publicis* means other communities than that of a municipium; and that *societates* refers to the large public companies (cf. *D. xvii. 2, l. 59*). I see Savigny takes this view (*System* § 87, note *e*; § 88, note *h*).

l. 52, § 11. Mr. M. is not unnaturally puzzled by the decision in the case of the wheat-dealer. But I think '*nomine ejus*' does not mean 'using his name' but 'on his account'; and the wheat-dealer did not take sufficient care to ascertain this fact. This is practically the gist of the words '*non enim mihi negotium sed sibi siliginarius gessit*.' 'He was not, as it happened, acting for me but for himself,' like a banker who pays a forged cheque.

ib. § 12. Mr. M. in his comments seems not to have considered the possibility of the man who got the slave out of custody being perfectly honest in believing the slave to be his own. The fact of his giving sureties shows him probably not to be a mere thief.

l. 54, § 3. This is another of the sections in which Mr. M. shows an imperfect conception of the principle on which the *actio furti*

is granted. It is limited to cases in which the plaintiff holds the thing as owner or by consent of the owner (l. 86). A voluntary *negotiorum gestor* is of course liable to him with whose business he has chosen to intermeddle; and by the cession of the owner's action he may obtain compensation for what he has to pay: but it is entirely for the owner to say whether he will use the action himself or not. A mere volunteer cannot occupy property where he chooses, and have an action for theft if the property be stolen. That is the owner's right, or the right of those to whom he gives a legal and responsible position in reference to it.

There are other sections on which I have noted some disagreement with Mr. Monro's views, but I have said enough, and perhaps more than enough, for the readers of this *Journal*. May I plead that the *Digest* is one of the most important literary monuments of the world and lies at the foundation of most civilized legislation? For us now in England it is chiefly matter for antiquarian study: its students are not as numerous as are found for Homer or pre-historic monuments, but perhaps all the more on that account respect is due to those who, like Mr. Monro, honestly and capably try to make rough places smooth, and to shed light on the somewhat hurried but most precious and fruitful labours of Tribonian. He has preserved to us a building which would otherwise have perished, and, if he adapted it to the practical wants of the time, he has in so doing freed it from much that otherwise would have hindered its continued life.

H. J. ROBY.

WEDD'S EDITION OF THE ORESTES.

The Orestes of Euripides edited with Introduction, Notes, and Metrical Appendix by N. Wedd, M.A., Fellow and Assistant Tutor of King's College, Cambridge. The University Press. 1895. 4s. 6d.

It is to be hoped that this excellent book will be largely used. The chief of its many merits seems to me to lie in the introduction, which treats in a masterly way of the poet's attitude towards his subject, showing how in the matter of bloodguiltiness the public for which he wrote had 'become more moral than its gods,' and how the large space which the difficulties of the moral problem occupied in the poet's mind led him

to 'sacrifice art to ethics.' It concludes with some useful remarks on the 'bearing of the play on contemporary events.'

Of the explanatory notes, too, there is little but good to be said. They are a thorough and scholarly guide to the text. Perhaps too many *alternative* interpretations are given. One could almost imagine that an inexperienced learner would thereby be encouraged to think that in Greek ambiguity was a virtue.

Critical questions are only slightly touched. The metrical appendix gives Dr. J. H. H. Schmidt's schemes of the choric passages; the necessary alterations having been made where the reading adopted is not that

adopted by Dr. Schmidt. The best argument in favour of such an addition to a school-book is that *if* a learner takes the trouble to master the notation and terminology, he will have learnt a good deal about Greek choric metres. On the other hand when a sceptic finds that the elaborate scheme will only suit one text and one arrangement, and that other books give other texts and other arrangements of lines, he will perhaps proceed to ask his teacher some awkward questions: e.g. how it is that in v. 179 the last syllable of δόμον which ends the v. (the next v. begins with a vowel) is represented in the scheme by □ (a μακρά τετράρηνος) followed by Λ (a pause equivalent to)? The only answer is: 'the other feet in which we have arranged the line have five short syllables, so we must call this *one* short *five* short, or the equivalent.'

For the rest, I will gladly take the opportunity of discussing with the author a few points in the notes on which I cannot unhesitatingly accept his views. L. 54 λιμένα ... ἐκπληρώων (πλάττη) W. 'filling (with his fleet)' as an alternative to Porson's 'traversing (with oars)': better still Heath's explanation: 'explore portum = explore navigationem: so = 'reach.' 182-6 the two alternatives which in translating στόματος... ἄπο or ἀπὸ λέχεος (χάρυν) render the latter phrase by '(the boon) which the couch gives' or 'issuing from the couch,' seem much inferior to Porson's ἀπὸ λέχεος 'away from the couch.' The two former give two genitives awkwardly to χάριν. 188 τί δ' εἶποις ἄλλο is Schmidt's reading: it squares with the metrical scheme, but not with any MS. reading, nor with the reading which the metrical note on p. 174 leads us to expect, which is τί δ' ἄλλο γ' εἶποις the reading of F. 194 HA. should come before καλῶς δ' οὔ, I conclude from note (1) on p. xxviii. (Intro.) that the editor did not mean here to desert the MSS. 228 for *intransitively* read *absolutely*. 362f. 'See Hom. Od. 4, 514 for an account of the interview.' In Homer the μάντις was Proteus, not Glaucus. 432 τὸ Τροία μῖσος, Τροία is a doubtful correction of Musgrave's for the MSS. Τροίας ('bringing up against my father the hate which dates from Troy') W. transl. 'the hateful thing done at Troy.' 547 ἕτερον ὄνομα W. 4 'a different title'—better, 'on the other count.' The Schol. has καθ' ἕτερον ὄνομα. ABFe have not δέ γ' but δ'. I suspect the true reading to be δ' εἰταῖρον ὄνομα 'on a kindred count.' 624 ἀμύνειν 'used imperatively': better to take

it as dep. on λέγω in 622 and with Kirchh. to reject 625 which is identical with 536. The mode of death has already been mentioned by T. at 614. 860 Is it correct to talk of 'lamenting the future'? 882 'there is a v. l. φίλον': not worth mentioning: a mere copyist's error, as the scholiast shows. The Schol. on 1023 (λείπει τὸ δαῖ φέρειν) shows that 1024 is a late insertion. It is a very instructive case, showing how interpolators dealt with apparently unfinished sentences. 1036 I have long thought that the right reading here was ξίφει θήγειν χέρα: for the expression cf. v. 1222 ὀπλιζόμεθα φασγάνῳ χέρας, and H. F. 195 οἶσοι δὲ τόξοις χεῖρ' ἔχουσιν εὐστοχόν. 1038 It should have been mentioned that not only Klotz but a scholiast takes τὸν Ἀγ. γόνον to refer to Orestes: also that a schol. says that Aristophanes read δόμον for γόνον. 1051 Much better to reject the v. with Kirchh. than to torture ἀμφὶ τοῖς ταλαπύροις into 'concerning us the wretched pair.' 1126 πρόσθεν δ' ὀπαδῶν W. 'before (killing) her attendants': better 'in the presence of her attendants.' 1129 All MSS. have οἱ ᾧ which W. prints first occurs in Ald. 1172-4 'In this case ἐνὸς γὰρ εἰ...σωτηρία forms the apodosis to εἰ ποθεν...θανοῦσιν.' Possibly σωτηρία is put by inadvertence for the last word of the preceding line: otherwise I cannot understand it. W. gets out of the difficulties of the passage by giving εἰτυχοῖμεν ἂν an *ironical* sense: 'I should be lucky if' i.e. 'it is impossible that.' I think the best way to take the whole passage (vv. 1172-4) is to put a full stop at the end of 1172, taking ἐνός (as in 1151 ἐνός γὰρ οὐ σφαλέντες ἔξομεν κλέος) to mean 'one of the two objects' (just mentioned),—the dying nobly, and the taking vengeance on Menelaus. The two foll. vv. will then be a wish (or perhaps an aposiopesis). 1188 'For δὴ τί see on 62.' There is no note on δὴ τιν' in 62. 1196 Has not this verse got out of place? It comes much better after 1198. Nauck suspects it of being spurious. 1208 'With λέχος supply αὐτῆς': better λέχος 'as a usual synonym for 'wife.' 1219 Best with v. Herwerden to reject this v. It is very awkward not to take σύμμαχος as well as κασ. with πατρός, and this the context forbids. The line probably comes from another play. 1221 λόγους πέμψας' ἔσω 'by sending a message in to us': surely it is 'calling out so as to be heard within,' 'sending your voice into the house.' 1387 σκύμνον, and not σκύμνον is the reading of all the MSS. This should have been mentioned. 1478 πρόκωπον 'with the handle in

front,' i.e. 'towards the hand, hence, ready for action': perhaps better 'with hilt advanced' i.e. drawn (forward) out of the sheath: hence *drawn* simply, which Suidas gives as its meaning. 1510 I doubt whether 'the natural way to take this line is to regard *Μενέλεω* as governed by *κραυγῇν ἔθηκας*.' It seems to me more natural, even if we neglect the foll. v., to take *Μενέλεω* with *βοηδρομεῖν*. 1520 For *ὥστε* for *ὥς* cf. also above v. 882. 1607 'μ' is omitted in some MSS.' should be 'in all the good MSS.' 1614

I don't believe in 'death' as a transl. of *σφάγιον* here: *σοὶ σφάγιον ἐκόμισ' ἐκ Φρυγῶν* 'To thee death was all I brought from Troy.' Nor can I see any reason for deserting the M. *σοὶ* for *σέ* as W. does, following Canter. The only misprints I have noticed are on l. 6 782-6 for 982-6, on 974 *ἐν πόλει* for *ἐν πολίταις*, 1123 text? *ταῖθ'* (translated 'the same as') for *ταῖθ'*, 1628 should have a full stop at the end.

E. B. ENGLAND.

WELLMANN'S PNEUMATISCHE SCHULE.

[*Philologische Untersuchungen* herausgegeben v. KIESSLING und WILAMOWITZ-MOLLENDORFF. Vierzehntes Heft.] *Die Pneumatische Schule bis auf Archigenes; in ihrer entwicklung dargestellt* von MAX WELLMANN. 8vo. Pp. 239. Berlin: Weidmann. 1895. Preis 7 Mk.

At the time when Galen wrote his voluminous works the great impulse which medicine had received from the Hippocratic school was waning. I trust that it is not to detract in any degree from the merits of that great man to say that in his works themselves some signs of decadence are to be seen by him who reflects upon them. Next to Hippocrates himself Galen stands forth in the history of medicine as the greatest of our predecessors. But Galen's genius was too splendid! A great observer, a great experimenter, and a great and wise physician, he was also a man of enormous learning and too ingenious a philosopher. Ardent in spirit, rich in imagination, fertile in hypotheses, profuse in eloquence, Galen rounded off the undeveloped figure of truth with a splendid mantle woven of his own genius and learning; so that modest truth was hidden in embroidery. Not only so, but the embroidery was more akin to the taste of the age than to the nature of truth herself; and truth and embroidery together bulked so largely that no one dreamed of reading Galen; unless to steal from him, and the thieves stole the wrong things, the apparel and not the vital substance. So it came about that as medicine, like other knowledge, fell to pieces in the lower empire, and indeed ceased to have any productive existence, the system of Galen, based upon the Hippocratic writings, upon Aristotle,

upon his own genuine work, but artificially reared into a great and largely artificial synthesis, was well calculated, even if it had not found the shelter of the mediæval church, to dominate medical thought, as indeed it did dominate it until the time of Vesalius and Harvey.

Now what were the beliefs of medical writers at and soon after the time of Galen?

First there were the Dogmatists who stood in the following of the school of Hippocrates, and who held the doctrine of the four elements or humours—the cold, the hot, the moist, and the dry; a classification older of course than Hippocrates. 'For Hot, Cold, Moist, and Dry, four champions fierce, Strive here for mastery, and to battle bring Their embryon atoms:' This school was a rational and even scientific school which professed both to observe phenomena and also to inquire into their laws, whether by dissection or other means. A second school was Methodism, which was satisfied to refer all symptoms and all disease to the variations of the 'strictum' and the 'laxum'; that is, to the restriction or laxity of the secretions and other fluids of the body. A third school was that of the Empiricists, who professed to be guided by obvious phenomena or symptoms only, and to repudiate all generalizing or inferential methods. This was of course no 'method' at all, but a denial of method. It is extremely difficult in modern language to put these tenets briefly in such a way as not to be misleading; however, so things approximately were with the Greek physicians of the empire. Now out of the Methodists arose the Pneumatists, who attributed to the *pneuma*, or a *pneuma* (for the word was used in more than one sense),

an influence in the production of diseases. Athenaeus, who was the founder of this school, recognized a fifth element, a sort of fiery vapour, which was the active agent of the body, and which flowed in the arteries and so on. I need not say that this invention of an active principle governing the admixture of atoms was not devised by this school, but was derived from Plato, Aristotle, and Erasistratus. However, the *pneuma* was neglected or actually denied by the 'methodist' physicians.

Now of these *Pneumatici*, of whom Galen gives us most information, Athenaeus of Cilicia (ca. A.D. 69) was the founder; Agathinos was one of his disciples, Theodorus and Magnus were others. Herodotus, towards the end of the first century, was, after Athenaeus, the most eminent member of the *Pneumatists*; the short list of them is completed by the names of Apollonius of Pergamon, Heliodorus, and last but not least, Archigenes of Apamea.

None of the works of the *Pneumatists* is extant, and we are indebted for all our knowledge of them to fragments and allusions in other writers, especially in Aretaeus, Galen, Oribasius, and Aetius. The little that is personally known of the *Pneumatists*, and these fossil remains of their works, have been admirably brought together by Herr Wellmann, who concludes his treatise with a survey (70 pp.) of the system of the school founded upon his collection. The author points out that the school taught not only clinical observation but also physiology, dietetics, pathology, and therapeutics.

The founder, Athenaeus, seems to have been one of the most attractive physicians of his time, and his works show a familiarity with those of Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics, especially of Chrysippus. To Agathinos his pupil Archigenes gives this excellent character—*πάντα ἀκριβῆς ὥν καὶ οὐ πιστεύων τῇ ἐκλογῇ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πείρας εἰς ἀσφάλειαν δέομενος.*

Herodotus was a physician of great eminence and success in Rome towards the end of the century; and Herr Wellmann points out that the terms of Galen's reference to him are alone sufficient to distinguish him from the sceptical philosopher of the same name: although Zeller and Simon Sepp were disposed to identify the two. Apollonius of Pergamon in certain fragments warns us not to bleed carelessly, lest we let out too much of the *pneuma*; on the other hand, he warns us that too great a plethora of the vessels and viscera may prevent the *pneuma* from coursing as actively about the body as it should do. Of Archigenes we have some biography in Suidas; unfortunately it is very scanty. He, like Herodotus, though holding the distinctive tenets, and much of the language of the *Pneumatici*, nevertheless was somewhat of an eclectic.

In the second part of the treatise the 'Quellen' are fully and thoroughly set forth and compared. The only reflection I have to make, I cannot call it a criticism, is that Herr Wellmann may not always have sufficiently borne in mind the tendency of philosophical writers, as of poets, to form a current language of their own; so that similar passages may not infrequently be coincidences rather than quotations or plagiarisms in bulk. The notes to the sources, as to the rest of the book, are thorough and sufficient in number. It is impossible, at present at any rate, to give any summary of the systematic results of the third part. I have already trespassed too far, but it seemed to me that this attempt of Herr Wellmann to reconstruct an extinct and almost forgotten school of philosophy and medicine deserves ample recognition. The study is a useful one, it is well executed, and does great credit to the scholarship and to the industry of the author, who acknowledges his indebtedness to Wilamowitz-Möllendorff. The print and paper are good.

T. CLIFFORD ALLEBUTT.

GILES' COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY.

A Short Manual of Comparative Philology for Classical Students, by P. GILES, M.A. Macmillan and Co. 10s. 6d.

MR. GILES deserves the thanks of all teachers and students of Comparative Philology for his admirable 'Manual.'

Without unfairness to other books already in the field, one may say that it is the first thoroughly satisfactory work of the kind. The most certain results achieved up to the present day are stated concisely and yet in such a way as to maintain the reader's interest and to let him see as much

as possible of the reasoning by which such results are arrived at. The work is intended for classical students and presupposes little knowledge of other than the classical languages. Its scope is therefore somewhat restricted: but in the first part, which is headed 'General Principles,' an account is given of the main facts and principles of Comparative Philology intelligible to such students.

The author's method is as far as possible to proceed from the concrete to the abstract, and to introduce general principles by means of illustrations which themselves serve as preliminary exercises in the elementary facts and methods of Comparative Philology. Thus the third chapter—'How do Indo-Germanic Languages differ from other Languages?'—begins with an analysis of simple words in cognate languages into their component parts, so as to show the essential character of Indo-Germanic word-formation. The fourth chapter, after giving a short sketch of the history of Comparative Philology leading up to the controversy between Curtius and the *Junggrammatiker*, asks the question: 'Is Philology a Science?' This leads to a discussion of the vexed question of the inviolability of phonetic laws, and the widespread action of analogy in its different forms is explained and illustrated by apt examples. In the two following chapters the leading facts and principles of phonetics are presented. The first part closes with an interesting chapter in which first English (taken as the most familiar example of the Teutonic languages) is compared with Latin and Greek, and then the relation of English to other Teutonic languages is explained. In this connexion a complete yet concise account of Grimm's and Verner's Laws is given.

The main part of the book, consisting of the second and third parts is taken up with the principles of Comparative Philology as applied to Latin and Greek. The arrangement calls for little notice: Part ii. deals with the relation of Greek and Latin sounds to those of the original Indo-Germanic language, including the facts of accent and vowel gradation; Part iii. treats of the formation of noun and verb stems, inflexion, and syntax. The whole exposition is singularly clear and accurate, and for the class of students for whom the work is intended practically complete. One or two matters (e.g. the discussion of the *tenues aspiratae*) are intentionally omitted, apparently for fear of introducing controversial matter.

In the case cited this is perhaps to be regretted inasmuch as forms containing Idg. *th*. must be assumed and are in fact given in a scheme of verbal endings (see p. 360). On the whole the author by no means shrinks from telling the student that there is much *adhuc sub judice* in Comparative Philology (see the notes on Bartholomae's *Vowel Series* and Streitberg's *Theory of Lengthened Grades* pp. 192, 193), though in the large type paragraphs he confines himself as far as possible to things certain. In the account of the history of *s* in Latin we should like to have seen a summary of the conclusions of Conway's *Verner's Law in Italy*: and the subject of the treatment of the Indo-Germanic accent in Greek would have gained in completeness by a short enunciation of the five rules stated in Wheeler's *Der Griechische Nominalaccent*.

The discussion of the inviolability of phonetic laws (already referred to) seems hardly convincing. Mr. Giles' argument seems to amount to this—that if phonetic laws are not inviolable then (1) Philology is not a science and (2) 'explanation' (*scilicet* of linguistic facts) becomes 'impracticable.' But surely (1) is a *petitio principii*: and as to (2), 'explanation' is precisely what Comparative Philology has refused so far to give, e.g. of the fact that intervocalic *s* becomes *r* in Latin, but disappears in Greek. The truth seems to be that it will not be until we can 'explain' linguistic phenomena, that is, assign their cause, that we shall be entitled to speak of 'laws' governing them: till then we are only dealing with observed uniformities. In the meantime 'inviolability' like other counsels of perfection leads in practice to excellent results.

A few points seem to require correction or addition:—e.g. on p. 87 the Germanic treatment of *i* and *u* should have been stated: ἡσθιον is an example of a primitive Idg. and not of an early Greek contraction, as stated on p. 100: p. 1051 Eng. 'reek' = Germ. *Rauch* and therefore cannot = Greek ἔρεβος: p. 159 Greek treatment of nasal or liquid + *u* should have been stated: p. 263 it is hard to agree with the author in assigning so important a position to the 'cognate accusative' as an early type; ὑπόσχεσθαι ἥπερ ἐπέστην and the like must be later than τοῦτο ἐπέστην. The distinction between 'external' and 'internal' accusatives, which is the real foundation of double accusatives like μηδὲν ὕγιες ἀλλήλας λέγειν (cited on p. 265), seems to be unnoticed. On p. 312 εἶς (*sem*-) and Homeric δῶ house

(cp. *δεσπότης* stem *dem-*) should have been added as original stems in *m*. Considering the serious difficulties presented by the vowels in Latin perfects like *vidi*, *cēpi* and *ēdi*, it seems rash to suggest that these forms go back to the primitive language, as is done on p. 391. P. 420 *véονται* is as much a future in form as *καλέω* and need not be treated as a present-future.

The book contains appendices on the Greek and Latin Alphabets, the Greek dialects and the Italic dialects. The two latter appendices give very brief sketches of the dialects dealt with and copious examples from inscriptions with a few explanatory notes. There are excellent indices of Greek and Latin words.

W. M. GELDART.

BRUCE TO HIS MEN AT BANNOCKBURN.

Scots, wha hae wi' Wallace bled,
Scots, wham Bruce has aften led,
Welcome to your gory bed,
Or to victory!

Now's the day, and now's the hour;
See the front o' battle lour;
See approach proud Edward's power—
Chains and slavery.

Wha will be a traitor knave?
Wha can fill a coward's grave?
Wha sae base as be a slave?
Let him turn and flee!

Wha for Scotland's king and law
Freedom's sword will strongly draw;
Freeman stand, or freeman fa',
Let him follow me!

By oppression's woes and pains!
By your sons in servile chains!
We will drain our dearest veins,
But they shall be free!

Lay the proud usurper low!
Tyrants fall in every foe!
Liberty's in every blow!—
Let us do or die!

BURNS.

ΘΥΜΩΙ ΓΗΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣΔΕ ΜΑΧΩΜΕΘΑ.

ἄνδρων μαχατᾶν ἔρνεα, λαγέταις
πάμπολλ' ὑπ' ἔσλοισ γευσάμενοι φόνω,
στρώμνα δάφουινος ὕμν' ἱαίνην
ὁμμένει ἢ μέγα σέμνον εὖχος.

ἄγων ὃδ' ἄμαρ κύριον ὄρννται
λόγχαις πεφρίκων σμέρδινος ἰδην Ἄρεος·
δουληίας πλάθει τύραννος
γάγγαμον ἄμμι φέρων· τὸ δ' ἔρρε

ὅττις προδώσεις γαῖαν, ὅτῳ τάφος
δειλῷ κέχαν' ἄκλαντος ἀνώνυμος,
ὅττις ζυγόν πέρθεσθ' ἐπ' ὤμοις
μῶεαι, ἔρρε λάθον τε χάρμας.

τὸ δ' ὅς πόλῃος τῶν νομίων ὑπερ
λαῖς πρόστατιν νόμῃκν κρατέρως σπάθαν,
ζῶων τ' ἅμα θναίσκων τε θάρσῃν,
τὸ ξὺν ἔμοι πόλεμόνδ' ὑμάρτη.

ὁμννμ' ὑβριστᾶν κάδεα καὶ πόνον,
ὁμννμ' παίδων δούλιον ἀνστρόφαν,
ἄδιστα γὰρ δεύσει τόδ' αἶμα,
ἦν πεδ' ἐλευθερίας θάνομεν.

αἰσχρον βιάτας πτώμα προπιπτεύω,
φθίνουσι νήλεις ὅσσοι ἀρείφατοι
φθίνουσ'· ἐλεύθερον τόδ' αἶμα
ἀρνύμεθ' ἢ θάνατον πρὸ πάτρας.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

NON ILLE PRO PATRIA TIMIDUS PERIRE.

SAEPE cum Valla comites dedistis
sanguinem, Scoti; duce saepe Bruto
proelia intrastis; moriamur ultro
ni superemus.

tempus advenit! datur hora Marti;
horret en armis acies, et instat
hostis Edvardus premat ut catenis
servitioque.

proditor si quis putet esse, si quis
malit ignavi reperire mortem,
turpiter si quis ferat esse servus,—
versus abito.

Scotiae qui pro duce legibusque
vindictam stringes metuendus ensem,
liber ut vivas pereasve liber,—
perge age mecum.

insolens per quae mala victor infert,
vincla natorum per acerba juro,
sanguis e venis semel hauriendus
liber abundat!

sternite in terram dominum superbum,
deperit quicumque perit tyrannus,
nos salus armat patriae, vocat nos
aut decus aut mors.

W. WALLACE.

[The above versions were sent to the Burns Centenary Committee.]

ARCHAEOLOGY.

MYKENAEAN CIVILIZATION.

HELBIG: *La Question Mycénienne* (Mém. de l'Acad. d'Inscr. xxxv.). 1896.

M. HELBIG feels acutely the manner in which 'anti-Semitic' archaeology has of recent years 'blackened' the character of the Phoenicians, and detracted from their inventive and beneficent genius; and calls upon all who read alphabetic script, or drink alcoholic liquors to combine with him in the task—the noblest which can fall to a historian' (p. 84)—of whitewashing the sepulchres of the first missionaries of the 'roman piquant' (all praise to Our Lady of Paphos!) and the 'vin passable' which have made subsequent civilizations tolerable.

Accordingly, in this essay, he has brought together a variety of considerations to support the thesis that Mykenaeon civilization originated in Phoenicia, and was propagated by Phoenicians over the Mediterranean at a period approximately contemporary with the Eighteenth Egyptian Dynasty.

He does not however appear to have consulted much of the recent literature of the subject; he rests mainly upon his own interpretation of the data furnished by the compilations of MM. Perrot and Chipiez; and he seldom displays any first hand ac-

quaintance with the materials which he uses.

M. Helbig's argument is as follows:—

(1) Mykenaeon art in the Aegean is 'exotic'; it appears there already mature, and is as abruptly extinguished; it is preceded, and followed, by a barbaric rectilinear style of decoration, with which it has little or nothing in common. Therefore it must have developed elsewhere, and have been introduced from without (p. 7). How far this assumption can be reconciled with notorious facts, we shall see hereafter.

(2) Certain rare finds show that 'Mykenaeon' art was represented in Phoenicia itself.

(3) Striking analogies exist between Mykenaeon art and the art of the Keftiu, a Levantine people who brought tribute to Egypt under the Eighteenth Dynasty, which is contemporary with the Mykenaeon Age (pp. 28 ff.).

(4) The Keftiu are the Phoenicians: therefore Keftiu art is the long-sought-for art of Phoenicia in the 'Sidonian Age' before the rise of Tyre in or about the tenth century B.C. The replacement of 'Sidonian' by Tyrian art explains the contrast between Mykenaeon art and the 'Phoenician' art of the seventh-sixth centuries.

(5) Loan-words in Greek show that many articles of luxury first became known in Greece under Semitic names: therefore

they were imported by Semitic merchants. This is logically unsound: *v.* below.

(6) The Epic, which is largely of Mykenaeen Age, and the great mass of Greek traditional history recognize 'Sidonian' importations, especially of metal-work, as superior to the native manufactures of Greece; and describe 'Sidonian' merchants in the Aegean: on the other hand, they indicate no early 'Achaean' commerce with Egypt, only occasional raids. Therefore 'Mykenaeen' art borrowed its Egyptian motives not directly but *via* 'Sidon.'

The comments which follow upon these several headings are only intended to indicate a few facts which appear to have escaped M. Helbig's notice, though no doubt he will be able to make them square with his theory.

(1) To doubt that the Keftiu are the Phoenicians, and that none but the Phoenicians are Keftiu is, according to M. Helbig, an 'entêtement sceptique.' After a careful re-examination of the able paper of MM. Maspero and Pottier, to which he refers (*Rev. Ét. Gr.* vii. p. 120 ff.), I regret that I remain 'sceptique,' though I believe not consciously 'entêté.' What I cannot explain away is the fact (1) that geographically, if not ethnologically, the Kaphtorim of Genesis x. 14 are related to Mizraim (Egypt) and the Philistines; not to Canaan, whose first-born is Sidon, and whose other descendants fill the Syrian interior: (2) that the name Kipta lingered on till quite late times at Caesarea (Neubauer, *La Géographie du Talmud*, p. 93), fifty miles south even of Tyre, and with Carmel between: (3) that the same name probably survived in Kephene, applied to the same neighbourhood (Lepsius, *Nub. Gramm.* p. ci.—cvii., cf. Maspero, *Hist. Anc.* p. 185).

Now this is just the part of the Syrian coast where Phoenician influence, so far as it existed at all, was throughout weakest; where Philistine (that is, immigrant) influence was throughout strongest in the pre-Tyrian centuries, and where we have, as at Tell-el-Hesi (Bliss, *Mound of Many Cities*, 1894), the clearest traces of commerce with Cyprus, another claimant of the name Kaphtor. It is possible, of course, that the Egyptians, coming from the South, may have extended a south Palestinian tribe-name to designate the whole Syrian coast: but we know that they did distinguish other towns and districts less distinct from the country of the Keftiu than the neighbourhood of either Tyre or Sidon.

(2) M. Helbig argues rightly (pp. 5-8)

that the mature Mykenaeen style postulates a long series of development; but if he infers from this that it did not develop in the Aegean he cannot be aware of (indeed he denies, p. 7) the existence of exactly this series of development within the area in question: which has been published in outline for many years (Fouqué's *Santorin*, 1862), and recently in very great detail especially by Italian and English archaeologists in Crete.¹ (Dümmler, *Ath. Mitth.* xi.; Perrot, *Histoire de l'Art.* vi.; Evans, *Cretan Pictographs*: cf. the unpublished results of M. Tsountas in Amorgos, 1894-5, and of the British School of Archaeology in Melos, 1896). The result of this series of observations, now continuous and adequate on all the important points, is to show that Mykenaeen art is essentially indigenous to the Aegean area, and that it does not appear except at a quite late stage in the Bronze Age in Cyprus; where, if it emanated from Phoenicia, it would be reasonable to expect that it would make itself felt first. In fact, it is, as we shall shortly see, in Cyprus, not in the Aegean, that Mykenaeen art is an exotic of late arrival; while on the Syrian coast, as M. Helbig admits, Mykenaeen art has hitherto hardly made its appearance at all.

(3) M. Helbig's indifference to the evidence of the earlier stages of Mykenaeen civilization is perhaps partly accounted for by his assumption that the 'Hellenes'—whom he does not further define, but apparently identifies with the 'recipients' of Mykenaeen culture in the Aegean—emerged in Greece suddenly and at a late date, from a nomad existence in Central Europe (p. 7, 10). Here he ignores the whole of the evidence recently accumulated, which indicates fully as important a connection *via* Crete with the Cyrenaica and Libya, as has been formerly asserted between Greece and Central Europe. It is true that N. Africa is *terra incognita* even more than Phoenicia, and that a 'Libyan

¹ Here Mykenaeen art has a continuous and indigenous descent from the culture of the early Bronze Age, and passes by insensible degrees back to a point, barely removed from the end of the Neolithic Age, where it joins, through the Hissarlik type, with the Cypriote Bronze Age culture, which however pursues a very different and peculiar career. Intermediate, and by no means early stages of this development can now be dated, on Cretan evidence, to the time of the Twelfth Egyptian Dynasty (Evans, *Cretan Pictographs*, p. 57 ff.; *J.H.S.* xiv. 326 ff.; Myres, *Proc. Soc. Antiq.* 2nd ser. xv. p. 351 ff.; Mariani, *Mon. Antichi*, 1896): and consequently the beginning of the process must far antedate any known data for Phoenician industry and commerce.

theory' of Mykenaeen culture *may* prove as baseless as the 'Karian theory' of MM. Köhler and Dümmler has proved, which was promulgated under similar circumstances. Consequently no conclusive evidence can be brought forward as yet; but at least it has not been shown for Libya as it *has* in the case of Phoenicia (*v.* below, p. 353) that an inferior and incongruous civilization existed there during the great period of Mykenaeen art. Meanwhile, everything that we do know of Libya indicates that during these centuries its wealth, civilization, and enterprise were such as to make it a dangerous, and even a rival, neighbour to Egypt: and it is at least as likely that the 'peoples of the isles of the sea,' who are represented on Egyptian monuments as allies of the Libyans, were influenced by Egyptian art *vid* Libya, as by the longer and at that time far more precarious route *vid* Phoenicia. This is a speculation which would take us far afield; but before the existence of similarities between Egyptian and Mykenaeen art can be accepted as proving Phoenician intermediation, it must at all events be shown that no alternative, or at least that no more direct intermediation is probable. And, in view of the Cypriote evidence which will shortly be quoted, it must be admitted that there was apparently a 'great gulf fixed' on the direct Levantine route between Phoenicia and the Aegean.

(4) If Phoenicia had really begun to establish transmarine trade in the centuries preceding 1000 B.C., it would have been reasonable to suppose that the earliest and fullest evidence would have been sought for, and found, in the deposits of that age in Cyprus; especially as Cyprus was throughout this period a main centre of the copper-industry, and certainly was in communication with Egypt, with the Syrian coast, Asia Minor, and the land route to Europe, and with the Aegean. It is therefore curious that, with the exception of a somewhat contemptuous, and certainly misleading, allusion (p. 40) to Dr. Ohnefalsch-Richter's *Kypros*, M. Helbig ignores uniformly the mass of material which has been accumulated during the last fifteen years, a large number of the published accounts of which have appeared in French and German sources. If M. Helbig had been aware of the Cypriote evidence, he might have been spared the labour of compiling some part of his essay: for the Cypriote Bronze Age is copiously represented, and has been very fully examined:

it has a long and characteristic development, and, as already stated, was in regular communication with the outside world. But it borrowed nothing till a quite late date which can be assigned to Phoenician sources; and, on the other hand, exported and taught much from an early period to the whole Syrian coast, from Sinjirli to Tell el Hesi.

In fact, though it lies within sight of the Lebanon, Cyprus owes nothing to either Mykenaeen or Syrian civilization until the Eighteenth Dynasty; its affinities are with Cilicia and Cappadocia; its nearest parallel is with Hissarlik; and when Mykenaeen art does at last reach it, it does so from the west (namely from Rhodes), and in a mature, not to say decadent, stage. And it is at this stage, and not earlier, that the first embryonic appearance occurs of a totally different style of pottery; which begins to be imported into Egypt somewhat earlier than into Cyprus, which barely reaches Crete, and does not touch Peloponnese; which, along with the Mykenaeen tradition, influences Cypriote pottery profoundly from the tenth to the seventh century; and the purest, most characteristic, and most stable offshoots of which are found in Carthaginian and Sardinian deposits of the seventh—sixth centuries; at the period, that is, when we have the first contemporary, as distinct from legendary, information about Phoenician trade in the Central and Western Mediterranean.

Thus, even the one allusion which M. Helbig makes to Cyprus (p. 40) exactly refutes his own argument. He points to the similarity of Mykenaeen and early Graeco-Phoenician pottery in Cyprus as evidence that Phoenician influence lasted on there through the sub-Mykenaeen Age. But if there is one thing clear about the sub-Mykenaeen Age in Cyprus, it is that the island remained the outpost of Aegean civilization in the west; that it maintained a syllabary more nearly related to the Aegean script than either the Greek or the Phoenician; that it imported and copied works of geometrical art, and retained this Aegean tradition, as it had retained the Mykenaeen, long after Egyptizing motives had gone west *vid* Naukratis, or Assyriizing motives *vid* Cappadocia and Lydia; and that it does not begin again to receive suggestions from the Syrian coast until the expansion of Assyria in the eighth century, or from Egypt till the rise of Hellenic commerce under the Twenty-sixth Dynasty. That is to say, that throughout the early

centuries of the presumed 'Tyrian' ascendancy, Cyprus is still passing through a style of sub-Mykenaeen decadence, analogous to, but slower than, what goes on in Rhodes, Crete, and the rest of the Aegean; but yet it is just at this period that Cyprus exported to Phoenicia the sub-Mykenaeen vases, and characteristically Cypriote flasks, which are all that M. Helbig produces as evidence of Mykenaeen manufactures in that country.

(5) M. Helbig, that is, appears, further, to under-estimate the extent to which the civilization of Phoenicia in the 'pre-Tyrian' period is known. For quite enough evidence has as a matter of fact come to light from early sites and tombs (*e.g.* in the collections of the missionary colleges in Beirut) to show that this series of 'leather-type' vases is common, if not indigenous, on the Syrian coast. Consequently these forms, common to Phoenicia and Carthage, and represented in the 'Tyrian Age' in Cyprus, may well be taken as typically Phoenician. If so, the contrast between these and the genuine Mykenaeen importations into Cyprus is most marked, and the only inference that can fairly be drawn from the evidence in question is that, so far as actual finds go, Phoenicia in the Mykenaeen Age was in a quite different circle from the Aegean, and on the whole very far behind it; that it did not influence Cyprus until the Mykenaeen Age, and, both before and after, was itself influenced by Cyprus; consequently, so far from the vases quoted by M. Helbig proving the manufacture of Mykenaeen pottery in Phoenicia, they themselves indicate importation from Cyprus, if not from further afield; and prove (if they prove anything) the barrenness and barbarism of 'pre-Tyrian' Phoenicia in comparison with the Mykenaeen area at the same period.

(6) Consequently M. Helbig's assumption that Mykenaeen pottery was made in Phoenicia (p. 14) fails to account for several points. He produces no evidence, literary or monumental, that the Phoenicians ever exported any pottery at all. Painted pottery, in particular, has been conspicuously absent from Phoenician sites hitherto. Of the two specimens of 'Mykenaeen' pottery which he is able to quote, one (Mus. Guimet. No. 10,896) is of a distinctly Cypriote fabric of late Mykenaeen stage usually associated with stilted fibulae and iron knives. The other (No. 10895) is also a late and apparently Cypriote imitation of a Mykenaeen vase, and falls into the same

category, though it is a little earlier in form. This Cypriote provenance is fully supported by a number of other instances of the importation of Cypriote fine pottery and terra-cottas into Phoenicia, and other parts of the Syrian coast, from Sinjirli to Tell-el-Hesi, not only during the sub-Mykenaeen period (tenth—eighth centuries B.C.) but throughout, and even before, the Mykenaeen Age (cf. *Cypr. Mus. Catalogue*, Myres and Ohnefalsch-Richter, Oxford, 1896, in the press).

Further, if Phoenicians made 'Mykenaeen' pottery in Phoenicia, they must have imported the clay for the purpose; and the nearest clay deposits from which the best Mykenaeen fabrics can be made are in Rhodes: Cyprus only produces a very inferior quality.

It is in any case very difficult to accept, as M. Helbig does, (p. 46), M. Pottier's bisection of Mykenaeen art into portable and imported, cumbrous and home-made objects; mainly on the ground that the pottery, which is eminently portable, and was actually as widely distributed as any Mykenaeen manufacture, was certainly made in the Aegean, and at a number of centres: at least if the differences of the clay and their conformity with local geological peculiarities can be accepted as an argument. That is to say, if Phoenicians traded in Mykenaeen pottery, they must have gone to Rhodes, to Crete, and to Peloponnese in order to find it. The same applies to the arguments from the 'island-stones' and the glass and porcelain work.

(7) If the earlier steatite island-stones were made in Phoenicia, where did the makers get their steatite; and how does it happen that no island-stones have been found in Cyprus (which uses Asianic cylinders in the Bronze Age and conical seals and scarabs afterwards) or in Egypt; whereas they increase in frequency and in perfection of workmanship as they approach the steatite masses of Crete (Evans, *Academy*, June 13, 1896), and whereas they have the *ἄγριον* (a wild goat peculiar to that island and to Melos) as one of their most persistent and characteristic motives.

If, by the way, the only evidence for the 'Phoenician' origin of the island-stone from Orvieto (p. 37, fig. 24) is that the same demon-type occurs on the vase-handle from Cyprus (fig. 25 = Perrot iii. fig. 556), the instance is an unfortunate one; for the only evidence of the Phoenician origin of the vase-handle ('incontestable' according

to M. Helbig) is that it is engraved in vol. iii. instead of vol. vi. of M. Perrot's work. It is a characteristic piece of later Mykenaeen work, and to call it Phoenician is simply to beg the question.

(8) The argument from glass and porcelain is that no Greeks made glass till the Ptolemaic Age; and considered glass in the fifth century as an oriental luxury (p. 11, 12). But M. Helbig proceeds to admit that Greeks at Naukratis *did* make glass in the seventh century, that they learnt the art from the Egyptians, and that the latter had practised it since the Old Empire. He produces no evidence that glass was ever made in, or exported from, Phoenicia. Of course it would be foolhardy to assert, in the present state of the evidence, that Greeks made glass continuously from the Mykenaeen Age onwards, but I am not aware that any one has ever made the assertion. But that glass was made in the Aegean in the Mykenaeen Age is indicated by the occurrence at Mykenae of actual moulds, cut in Aegean steatite. That all the Mykenaeen glass was home-made is shown by the uniformity of the fabric, and by its total divergence of form and colour from anything known in Egypt or elsewhere: in Phoenicia it has not been found at all. Egyptian porcelain and glass-paste were imported during the Mykenaeen Age; but are quite rare, are clearly distinguishable from this native fabric, and are definitely Egyptian, with no traces of 'Phoenician' imitation.

The following further considerations may be raised in regard to the porcelain:—

(a) Blue is frequently used for metallic objects in Egyptian frescoes; consequently the blue objects in the Rekhmara tomb (p. 32-3), are not necessarily of porcelain.

(b) No Phoenician manufacture, distinct from the Egyptian, can be recognized before the seventh century, and M. Helbig himself admits (pp. 34, 70) that the art was borrowed by Phoenicians from Egypt at a quite uncertain date. The Corneto scarab (quoted p. 79) is a good example: but being of Thirteenth Dynasty date, it is of no chronological value; and the mere fact that an Egyptian scarab was found in an early Etruscan tomb is absolutely no evidence that a Phoenician brought it to Etruria, especially in view of the probable relations in which Etruria stood to the native states of North Africa.

(c) In Cyprus Egyptian porcelain ornaments occur in the Bronze Age, along with a distinct native fabric which is not repre-

sented in Phoenicia. In the sub-Mykenaeen Age they are very rare indeed; but they suddenly become common in the seventh century, and are then of definitely Naukratite fabric. No example is known with a Phoenician inscription. The same applies to the porcelain from Rhodes: it has yet to be proved that any of it is Phoenician and not Naukratite. It has not been found in Phoenicia; except very rarely, and late. The tints are all Saïte, and there is no evidence that any of it goes back before the beginning of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty. Glass in Cyprus begins in the Bronze Age, with very coarse variegated beads in the ninth—eighth centuries. 'Phoenician' (i.e. Naukratite) glass vessels do not appear till the sixth and then still very rare.

(d) In any case there is a gap of several centuries between the glass and porcelain of Mykenaeen sites, and the earliest known specimens of reputed Phoenician manufacture. The alabaster frieze with *κνανός σκευαστός* from $\frac{1}{2}$ Tiryns differs *toto caelo* from the Assyrian ivory plaques inlaid with *κνανός αἰθοφύης* (p. 33): and the latter are fixed by their style and their Phoenician inscriptions to the seventh, or at most to the eighth, century.

(e) All M. Helbig quotes for Phoenician porcelain is a pair of statements, without datemark, (a) from Ps.-Skylax, *Περίπλους* 112, that they sold *λίθον αἰγυπτίαν* [presumably therefore *not* of their own manufacture] on the West African coast, (β) from Theophr. *Περὶ λίθων* § 55, given on Egyptian authority, that Phoenicians and others (M. Helbig omits this qualification) brought tribute of *κνανός* to Egypt; where it is definitely the raw material which is brought to be worked up in Egypt, while there is nothing in the passage to show that *κ. σκευαστός* was worked anywhere but in Egypt.

(f) Khuenaten's glass-paste and porcelain at Tell-el-Amarna was all made on the spot: and the moulds are of local clay: contrast the Mykenaeen moulds which are all of *steatite*.

(g) M. Helbig adduces also, as evidence of community of style between Mykenaeen and early Phoenician art, certain bronze statuettes of warriors which have been found in Phoenicia, at Mykenae and Tiryns, and recently by Mr. Evans in the east of Crete (Ashm. Mus. Oxford: unpublished). Note, to begin with, that the Phoenician specimens are from North Phoenicia, and cannot therefore be used as direct evidence for either 'Sidonian' or 'Tyrian' art: also

that M. Helbig admits that the Aegean examples come from late Mykenaeen layers. He ignores the oriental and un-Mykenaeen helmets which they wear, and the total contrast between their stiff oriental modelling and the thoroughly naturalistic Mykenaeen style of the Kampos statuette (fig. 13) and of the men on the Vaphio cups. But he rightly notices that these statuettes all had originally a shield on the left arm: that is to say, a parrying shield like that represented in Assyrian or Egyptian battle scenes, but of a type which did not reach the Aegean till the eighth—seventh centuries, and was then taken to be characteristically *Karian*, not *Phoenician*; though Greek traditional archaeology did not usually underestimate its indebtedness to Phoenicia. But since the Mykenaeen equipment is universally the body-shield (as Dr. Reichel has conclusively shown), M. Helbig is forced to assume that the latter was 'Sidonian,' and that the round-shield was a 'Tyrian' innovation. In that case what do these warrior-statuettes prove, if they are 'pre-Tyrian,' except that they are themselves exotic importations, both in the Aegean and in North Phoenicia? And if, as he indicates, Tyre does not come to the front till the tenth century, and the statuettes wear 'Tyrian' armour, they are of no value as evidence for the Mykenaeen art or armament of the fourteenth. The conspicuous value in fact of these statuettes is as genuine works of Phoenician—at all events Syrian-coast—art of the later Mykenaeen Age; and it is their rarity in Greece, their comparative frequency in Phoenicia, and their *dissimilarity* and inferiority to really Mykenaeen statuary, that gives them this value as evidence of what Phoenician art really was like at or before the time of the rise of Tyre. Further, the very fact that the examples of these statuettes which come from Mykenaeen sites are 'd'un style plus souple' may well indicate that they are made for exportation to a more naturalistic market; though it is questionable whether the want of rigidity in their outlines is not rather due to the careless casting which M. Helbig notices elsewhere (p. 49) as characteristic of Phoenician wholesale exports.

(10) Similarly, M. Helbig argues that the thoroughly Oriental loin-cloth of these figures is to be equated with the characteristic and peculiar girdle of the Kampos statuette,¹ and of the erect man on the

Vaphio cup (the two men tossed by the bull on the other cup, naturally have the garment deranged). But the two garments are absolutely different. The one is a rectangular cloth wrapped round the loins and confined by a belt; the other is a shaped garment passing between the legs, like the drawers worn by the men on the lion dagger, and is not represented on any Oriental monument except the seventh century silver bowl from Kurion which M. Helbig quotes (fig. 15): and we know enough about Cyprus to say that it is here, if anywhere, that we are likely to meet with a Mykenaeen survival, cf. *Cypr. Mus. Cat.* No. 5572, a male statuette of sixth century with similar woven drawers *painted*, from the Kamelargà site at Larnaka. These survivals, if they are so, are quite clearly distinct from the costume of the more usual Orientalizing statues of seventh—sixth centuries in Cyprus and Syria which regularly wear the same loin cloth as the earlier bronze warrior statuettes (v. Ohnefalsch Richter, *Kypros* Pl. xc. (marked Syria), xci. (Cyprus), cf. *id.* fig. 225, bronze bowl from Olympia).

The Homeric *μίτρη*, by the way, is surely not the girdle, but the *flexible* garment (cf. *αἰολο μίτρη*) which depends from it. The girdle itself is *ζωστήρ*, perhaps also *ζῶμα*, when it supports the *μίτρη*.

(11) Exactly the same general conclusion, that Phoenicia is indebted to Mykenae, not *vice versa*, is indicated by recent evidence in the matter of the Phoenician alphabet. On the one hand, it becomes clear that the absence of 'pre-Tyrian' Phoenician inscriptions, in or out of Phoenicia, is due to the fact that throughout the Eighteenth Dynasty at all events the peoples of the Syrian coast commonly wrote the cuneiform script. On the other, the Cretan discoveries of Mr. Evans show a much nearer prototype of the Phoenician letters than any yet suggested in the Aegean pictographic system, with its evident connection with the Hittite, and its parental relation to Cypriote, to Lycian, and to some local Greek alphabets. Compare the passage of Diodoros, quoted by Mr. Evans, to the effect that, according to the Cretan tradition, the Phoenicians had adapted symbols to alphabetic writing, but had not invented them. Phoenician letters in fact begin chronologically just at the point where Cretan linear symbols go out of use; namely about the eleventh or tenth century. Is it not also worth noting that

following (as usual) M. Perrot. M. Tsountas always refers to it by the more accurate place-name *Κάμπος*: *Αβία* is the 'deme' of Lakonia in which *Κάμπος* lies.

¹ Fig. 13. = Perrot. vi. fig. 351 = *Τροῦντας, Μυήναι*, Pl. xi. M. Helbig refers to this as from 'Abbia,'

the earliest known Phoenician inscriptions (*C.I.S.* i. pp. 22-26) were found not in Phoenicia, but in Cyprus.

(12) Consequently we are now in a position to offer an alternative explanation of the similarity between the *chef-d'œuvres* of Mykenaeen art and the offerings of the Keftiu in the Rekhmara frescoes. We have the strongest probability that the Phoenician alphabet is a modification to Semitic uses of a linear script such as that in use at Tell-el-Hesi and Gurob, and of the same family as the Cypriote syllabary: we have a strong tradition that the Philistines of South Syria were actually immigrants from the West, and allied to the 'peoples of the sea' who harry the Egyptian Delta during the centuries of the Philistine supremacy in Palestine: we have even some evidence which connects the Philistine Cherethites with Crete, and we know that Tell-el-Hesi (Lachish?) imported bronze and pottery from Cyprus under the Eighteenth Dynasty. We know that Mykenaeen manufactures were imported into Cyprus in the later Bronze Age: we know that Cyprus in the Bronze Age was at least not behind the Syrian coast in civilization. Why should not Mykenaeen metal-work, made in the Aegean from ulterior sources of gold, have been imported into the Syrian coast as articles of luxury, and so have been the most desirable presents to an Egyptian conqueror?

If so, there is no reason, beyond the present evidence of barrenness and backwardness in Phoenicia, why we should not admit that Phoenician artists copied the finest art of the fourteenth—tenth centuries, namely the Mykenaeen, just as they copied the finest art they knew in the eighth and sixth. In that case the allusions in sub-Mykenaeen epic to 'Sidonian' exports of Mykenaeen or sub-Mykenaeen style would have nothing to surprise us. Only it does not follow that they were exported, to begin with at all events, by seafaring 'Sidonians.' And this leads to a further consideration.

(13) Even assuming that Phoenicia had a great manufacturing industry and that Phoenician tribute thereof came by land to Egypt under the Eighteenth Dynasty, it still remains to be proved that Phoenicia had any trade by sea with the further parts of the Mediterranean at that time. Loan-words are evidence of the names applied to objects of commerce at their place of origin, or at their last great place of trans-shipment or exchange: they are no evidence that the objects were imported into the

country by foreigners in whose language the loan-words occur. The existence of Arabic or Chinese loan-words in English or German is very far from proving that ginger or tea are or ever were brought to Europe and disseminated by importunate Arabs or Chinamen. Even when we talk of an East India merchant we do not mean a Bengali or a Malay; nor, when a German speaks of *Kolonialwaaren*, does he mean that the trade of Hamburg is in the hands of Swahelis or Papuans. Consequently we must wait for more direct and material evidence before we assume that *χουρός*, *χρῶνες*, etc. were brought to Greece in Phoenician boats; or even that *Σιδόνιοι ἄνδρες* means Semites from the Syrian coast.

In fact the only really indisputable evidence, that of the vocabulary of sailing terms in Greek, points—as Beloch has pointed out—wholly the other way, and indicates that Greek seamanship was already fully established before Phoenician navigation reached the Aegean or its neighbourhood. This again is borne out by the fact that the representations of Aegean shipping, on Cretan gems¹ which go back far beyond the Eighteenth Dynasty, show no trace of borrowing from Phoenician types: but that, if anything, the Phoenician ships have borrowed from the Aegean.

(14) M. Helbig's criticism of Beloch's treatment of the Homeric evidence for 'Sidonian' commerce, though partly valid, fails to do justice to several points in the case. M. Helbig fails to prove that all Homeric Phoenicians are Sidonian, which is essential to his case; he fails to refute the argument, which he himself admits, that the mention of iron betrays sub-Mykenaeen date for a passage; and that consequently no inference can be drawn for 'pre-Tyrian' Phoenicia from the great passages in *Od.* xiv. (*σιδηρός* l. 324) and *Od.* xv. (Taphians l. 427, who are irontraders *Od.* i. 184). Further, if Homeric passages are to be admitted at all, they must be admitted as evidence on both sides; and in that case, against three passages where Phoenicians visit the Greek world (*Il.* xxiii. 744, *Od.* xiii. 272, xv. 415 ff.²) we have to set an equal number of passages in which Greeks visit Phoenicia, and carry off valuables thence: (1) *Il.* vi. 289 ff. *Paris*; (2) *Od.* iv. 615 (= xv. 115 ff.) *Mene-laos* (*Od.* iv. 581 (Egypt) is not reckoned, as it may refer to the same journey); (3) *Od.* xiv. 291 ff. *Odysseus*): besides the Taphian visit

¹ Evans, *J.H.S.* xiv. 367 ff.

² *Od.* xiv. 288 ff. is not reckoned, because the voyage was to be to Libya. l. 295.

in *Od.* xv. 427 ff. In two of these cases (*Od.* xv. 427 ff. *Il.* vi. 289 ff.) skilled slaves are carried off; in another a *chef-d'œuvre* of metal-work (*Od.* iv. 615). On the other hand, against the ἀθήματα of the Phoenician traders at Syria we have to set the fact that the runaway slave carries off thence three golden goblets from the ordinary dining-table of the men. Moreover, against the bare mention of two 'Sidonian' silver cups, *Il.* xxiii. 743, *Od.* iv. 615, which are all the evidence of Sidonian metal-work that there is in the epic, we have to set the elaborate description of the cup of Nestor *Il.* xi. 632 ff., the περόνη of Odysseus *Od.* xix. 226 (where M. Helbig compares a Cypriote gem, *Epos*,² p. 387), and the arms of Achilles, none of which are noted as of other than indigenous workmanship; and the frequent and familiar allusions to indigenous arts and crafts. Even the breastplate of Kinyras (*Il.* xi. 19 ff.) is not Phoenician but Cypriote; and we know enough now about Cypriote metallurgy to accept the allusion wholly, in the sub-Mykenaeen context where it occurs; while in any case it has a set-off in the breastplate of Meges (*Il.* xv. 529-31), which comes from Ephrya, a bronze-working centre of the West.

(15) Again, according to Justin xviii. 5 (accepted by M. Maspero, *Hist. Anc.* p. 318), Sidon was shattered by Philistines, and so the Philistine domination is to be interposed between the 'Sidonian' and the 'Tyrian.' And the 'Tyrian' certainly does not begin later than the beginnings of iron—according to M. Helbig's dating. But we have iron and ironworkers mentioned in two 'Sidonian' passages of the epic. Therefore either the 'Sidonian' name must have lasted on into the 'Tyrian' period, which M. Helbig denies; or else his dating of the periods is inaccurate, and the Sidonian age must be brought down below the tenth century. But in that case these Homeric mentions of Sidon are posterior to the great Mykenaeen period; and consequently prove nothing about the derivation of Mykenaeen art from Sidonian. It is quite conceivable, on the other hand, that having learned Mykenaeen art in the period of Aegean invasions (Eighteenth—Nineteenth Dynasty) Phoenicians—even Sidonians, either at Sidon or refugees in Tyre—may have continued to make metal-work of sub-Mykenaeen types, after the northern invaders had put a stop to Mykenaeen manufacture in Greece itself.

These are some of the difficulties which present themselves on a first reading of M.

Helbig's suggestive essay. No doubt evidence will appear before long which will decide between his theory and its predecessors. In the meanwhile, we cannot but be grateful to him for the lucid and ingenious presentation which he has given of both the strength and—if we may say so—the weakness of the view which he has chosen to adopt.

JOHN L. MYRES.

DELOCHE ON THE WEARING OF RINGS IN ANCIENT TIMES.

Le Port des Anneaux dans l'Antiquité Romaine et dans les premiers siècles du Moyen Âge, par M. DELOCHE (Extrait des *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscr.* T. xxxv. Partie II.). 4to. pp. 112. Paris, 1896.

M. DELOCHE is more at home with mediaeval than Roman antiquities and would have done better had he confined himself to the second half of his subject. He has published from time to time various rings of the Merovingian and other early periods, and in his essay gives some interesting information concerning episcopal, betrothal and wedding rings.

We suspect that the account of the Roman use of rings is given as an attempt to explain the mediaeval usage. It contains little or nothing that cannot be found in a good dictionary of antiquities and is based solely on literary evidence. This is a pity, for an examination of the Roman rings in our Museums would be much more welcome than the discursive account of the *jus anulorum* which fills up some forty pages of this treatise. It may however be recommended to those who are interested in ecclesiastical archaeology.

W. C. F. ANDERSON.

GREEK COINS ACQUIRED BY THE BRITISH MUSEUM IN 1895.

DURING the past year 667 coins of the Greek class were acquired by the British Museum. Among the noteworthy specimens described by Mr. Wroth (*Numismatic Chronicle*, 1896, p. 85 ff.; Pl. VII.) the following may be mentioned:—No. 5. A bronze coin, the second discovered, of Eurea in Thessaly, a town known only from coins. No. 7. A small but beautiful coin of Pheneus in Arcadia showing Hermes

seated on a basis of two steps. Probably suggested by an original in sculpture. No. 9. An electrum stater of Cyzicus (fifth century, late) type, Herakles holding club and horn. No. 11. A new silver coin of Neandria in the Troad showing a ram biting the leaves of a branch. No. 16. A bronze coin, of the first century B.C., of Hydisus, a Carian town to which no money has been previously assigned. No. 22 (Pl. VII. 15). A unique electrum stater (of Miletus?), showing two lions standing on their hind legs and each resting a forepaw on the capital of a column between them, a type recalling the Lion Gate of Mycenae and early Phrygian monuments. This coin can hardly be later than B.C. 650.

WARWICK WROTH.

MONTHLY RECORD.

GREECE.

Athens.—Dr. Dörpfeld, in his search for the old Enneakrounos and the old Agora, has found a number of rock-basins connected by passages, which he holds to belong to a pre-Periklidian period. The complete clearance of the Areopagus rock is being carried out, and on the west side the foundations have been traced of a number of houses divided by narrow alleys; in one of these houses a large number of moulds for terracotta figures were found, suggesting that a *κορπιαστής* must have lived there.¹

Corinth.—The excavations of the American School have resulted in the discovery of the theatre; it has been badly broken up, but in three places the lines of the ascending steps are plainly seen, converging to a point below. The steps are deeply worn by foot-prints. These remains are some ten or fifteen feet underground. Round the upper part of the *cavea* were fifty more or less broken archaic terracotta figures, probably *ἀναθήματα*, which suggest the proximity of a temple. One is complete, and represents a goddess of the Aphrodite type. East of the temple a magnificent *stoa* was discovered, which helps to throw light on the position of the agora. The theatre has long been regarded as the key to the topography of Corinth, and much may now be done to interpret the description of Pausanias.²

Mycenae.—A new beehive tomb has come to light, but is not as yet explored; it does not appear ever to have been disturbed. M. Tsountas has found a painted *stèle* with warriors of a type similar to those on the well-known vase from Mycenae.³

Delphi.—The chief finds of late have been a marble statue of a draped woman without head or arms, of the Roman period, and four interesting inscriptions, three of the fourth and one of the second century B.C. The first relates to a bankrupt and the legal administration of his affairs; the second gives information on the manner of life of runners in the races. They were not allowed new wine, and if they transgressed, they paid a fine to the god and appeased him by libations of that wine, while the informer received half the fine. The other two were

found in the pavement of the Sacred Way, and one refers to the restoration of the temple of Apollo in the fourth century, the other gives a list of the *ἑταῖοι* of Delphi in the second century, geographically arranged. Near the great altar of the Chians was found a bronze cow of archaic style, excellent workmanship, and good preservation; also a vulture's head which had ornamented a tripod, and a very archaic statuette. Numerous other bronze objects have been found; spear-heads, an elegant jug, an archaic ring, a ram, fragments of a lion, a small bull, a male statuette, and a two-edged axe, mostly of good workmanship and archaic. The stadium is being laid bare, and many inscriptions have been found.³

Thera.—Herr Hiller von Gaertringen has set on foot excavations with successful results. He found an ancient cave and a temple before it with numerous inscriptions of the first cent. B.C., including dedications to Hermes and Herakles set up by a gymnasiarch. To the north-east of this were remains of a very ancient temple of the Carneian Apollo with precinct and *pronaos*; behind it, two chambers communicating with the temple. Here were found numerous fragments of statues; three large torsos, probably of priestesses; and two inscriptions, one mentioning a priest of Apollo Karneios who had relations with Antiochus of Syria (267–246 B.C.). To the south-west of this was the Nymphæum, as shown by existing inscriptions. In another place were found remains of an Ionic temple, and fragments of sculpture from the cella; among the reliefs are to be seen a panther and a krater, so that it was probably dedicated to Dionysos; furthermore the inscriptions mention a *Διδύμιος πρὸ πόλεως*. Within the temple were fragments of geometrical vases and part of a painting representing a bearded man with the body of a quadruped, also a torso and thirty-seven inscriptions. Further excavations have brought to light an inscription of A.D. 145 relating to T. Flavius Clitosthenes Claudianus; also part of a city-wall, fragments of statues, and other inscriptions of the Roman period.⁴

CRETE.

Mr. Arthur Evans has given a further account of his recent explorations. On the north coast he found almost everywhere the traces of a Mycenaean civilization. Among his chief finds in this district may be mentioned: *pitthoi* with reliefs of the eighth century B.C., almost proto-Corinthian in character, one representing a Centaur brandishing a palm-tree; a Mycenaean gem with a man in a loin-cloth who has lassoed an animal with ram's horns and drags it down with the aid of a dog; a stone celt and a haematite chisel; terracotta oxen and vases found in a votive cave, and a gem with two lions and a column between, strongly recalling the gate at Mycenae; taken in conjunction with other evidence this seems to suggest the prevalence of baetylic worship at that period. On the south coast Mr. Evans was similarly successful; at one point he found a threshing-floor (*ἀλώνιον*) dating back to the Mycenaean period, consisting of rings of upright stones with paving in between. It appears possible that the so-called Agora at Mycenae, which this resembles, may have been a royal threshing-floor. [A similar conjunction of a threshing-floor with Mycenaean remains occurs at Episkopi in Cyprus.—H. B. W.] At Hierapytna he found a pictographical seal of red carnelian, and a unique painted double

¹ *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 15 Aug.

² *Academy*, 8 Aug.

³ *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 27 June.

⁴ *Ibid.* 11 July.

bowl; at Kalamafka, part of a small fluted column of grey Cretan marble, which may be restored on the lines of the half-column from the treasury of Atreus. At Legortino, a considerable Mycenaean settlement, lasting into classical times; here were bee-hive tombs containing coffers, one with a painted design on the lid of water-fowl and plants, derived from an Egyptian original.⁵

CYPRUS.

Enkomi (Salamis).—The British Museum excavations here during the present year have so far had most important results. A Mycenaean necropolis of considerable extent and wealth was discovered in March, and for some months has continued to yield valuable and interesting objects, most of which seem to be of remarkably late date. The most noteworthy are as follows: A gold finger-ring with dedication in hieroglyphs to the goddess Mut, apparently about 700 B.C. Several massive gold pins (*περόναι*) used for fastening garments on the shoulders, such as are seen on the François-vase. Two ivory carvings, a lion attacking a bull and a man slaying a Gryphon. The man has a very Oriental appearance; the expression of fear on the Gryphon's face is very fine. Layard found a similar ivory group at Nineveh, which must date between 850 and 700 B.C. The bull is of the Carian breed, with a hump; it suggests a possible confirmation of the theory that Mycenaean objects are of Carian origin. It has more style than the bulls of the Vaphio cups. One tomb was intact, and contained numerous gold articles, also a porcelain vase in the form of a female head surmounted by a cylindrical cup. It is not Egyptian, as might be expected, but distinctly of an archaic Greek type, but it has no handle, and it must be earlier than the sixth cent. B.C. In this tomb were a necklace of gold beads, a number of gold earrings, and bands of thin gold stamped with Mycenaean patterns. A lapis lazuli gem was also found, which is very remarkable, as such stones are always of late date. Several of the tombs were square, and built of squared stones jointed in the archaic manner, covered in by two large slabs, with doorway and *σπόμους*, but most of them were simply sunk in the rock.⁶

Journal of Hellenic Studies, vol. xvi. part 1.

1. An investigation of the topography of the region of Sphakteria and Pylos (Plates I.-III.). G. B. Grundy.

He shows that Thucydides' account is historically accurate and only makes one serious topographical error, afterwards corrected.

2. Pylos and Sphakteria (Plate VIII.). R. M. Burrows.

Discusses the exact identification of these localities, showing that Thucydides' description is probably right.

3. What people produced the objects called Mycenaean? W. Ridgeway.

Gives reasons for ascribing them to a pre-Achaean and pre-Homeric people, i.e. the Pelasgians.

4. Archaeological research in Italy during the last eight years. F. von Duhn.

5. Pompeian paintings and their relation to Hellenic masterpieces, with special reference to recent discoveries. Talfourd Ely.

Describes paintings of Herakles strangling the snakes, Dirke and the bull, and the death of Pentheus.

6. The Megalithic temple at Buto: Herodotus ii 155. A. W. Verrall.

Herodotus' account is inaccurate, for architectural reasons.

7. On a group of early Attic lekythi (Plates IV.-VII.). R. C. Bosanquet.

Describes a group of white-ground lekythi of similar style and subject, with similar inscriptions, dating about 480-430 B.C.

8. Inscriptions from Crete. J. L. Myres.

9. Karian sites and inscriptions (Plate IX.). W. R. Paton and J. L. Myres.

An account of explorations in 1893-4.

H. B. WALTERS.

Revue Numismatique. Part 2, 1896.

E. Babelon. 'Le tyran Saturninus.' On a unique aureus, found in Egypt, bearing the name and portrait of Saturninus (IMP. C. IVL. SATVRNINVS AVG reverse, Victory). According to Vopiscus, Saturninus, who had been an able general of Aurelian, was saluted as Augustus by the people of Alexandria in the reign of Probus, A.D. 280, but retired to Syria where he allowed himself to be proclaimed. Mommsen and others have doubted the existence of Saturninus, but the present coin—the authenticity of which seems to be unquestioned—confirms Vopiscus at least in essential points. From its provenance and style, this specimen may be assigned to the mint of Alexandria, and M. Babelon suggests that Saturninus was probably proclaimed emperor in that city, and not in Syria, as Vopiscus asserts.—R. Mowat. 'Monnaies inédites ou peu connues de Carausius.' Includes a bronze coin inscribed IMP C M AV M CARAVSIVS, i.e. Imperator Caesar Marcus Aurelius Mausaius Carausius.—J. A. Blanchet. 'Essais monétaires romains.' On bronze coins of Tetricus and his son, which probably served as 'patterns' for aurei.—Review of Blanchet's 'Les monnaies romaines.'

Numismatic Chronicle. Part 1, 1896.

Hermann Weber. 'On some unpublished or rare Greek coins.' With three plates. Coins in Dr. Weber's collection. Among them are two fine gold staters of Lampsacus, types, head of Hera, and head of bearded Dionysos.—G. F. Hill. 'A portrait of Perseus of Macedon.' On the well-known 'Ajax' head in the British Museum (*Guide to Græco-Roman Sculptures*, 1874, no. 139, p. 48 = Bruun's *Denkmäler*, no. 80) which the writer maintains, on the evidence of the Macedonian regal coins, is a portrait of Perseus king of Macedon (178-168 B.C.). The head and a similar head in the Louvre are photographed in Pl. IV.—Sir John Evans. 'On some rare or unpublished Roman medallions.' Suggests that some of the medallions may have been made to serve as models for the country mints.—Talfourd Ely. 'The process of coining as seen in a wall-painting at Pompeii.' On the painting found in the *Casa dei Vetti*. The striking (by Cupids) of the *flan* on the anvil; the weighing of the coin before the monetary magistrate, &c. are shown.

Part 2, 1896.

Warwick Wroth. 'Greek coins acquired by the British Museum in 1895.'—Arthur J. Evans. 'Contributions to Sicilian numismatics. II.' Deals with many interesting details in the history and numismatics of Zancle, Messina, Catana, Leontini, &c.—George Macdonald. 'Notes on Combe's Catalogue of the Hunter Cabinet.' Corrections and re-attributions.

⁵ *Academy*, 4 and 18 July.

⁶ *Times*, 27 July, 1896.

Numismatische Zeitschrift (Vienna). Vol. xxvii., for 1895 (published 1896).

F. Imhoof-Blumer. 'Die Münzstätten Babylon zur Zeit der makedonischen Satrapen und des Seleukos Nikator.' A very useful description of the coins assignable to the Babylon mint from the time of the Satrap Mazaïos (B.C. 331) to B.C. 306. Seleucid coins hitherto attributed to Larissa on the Orontes are shown (p. 16) to be either of Babylon or of Seleucia on the Tigris. A tetradrachm of Antiochus II. (B.C. 261-246) struck at Alexandria Troas (described p. 19) has the ω form of omega in the inscription, being its earliest occurrence on coins. The σ form of sigma, so far as the Seleucid coins are concerned, first appears on coins of Seleukos II. B.C. 246-226.—J. Raillard. 'Polemon von Pontos und Antonius Polemon von Olba.'—B. Pick. 'Die Personen- und Götternamen auf Kaisermünzen von Byzanzion.' On the Imperial coins from Trajan to M. Aurelius the names are those of divinities and of various citizens regarded as *heroes*. (The letters HP on the coins are to be completed HPΩOC).

The Imperial coins of Mytilene described by me in the *Classical Review* for 1894, pp. 226, 227 with portrait heads of famous citizens furnish a parallel. On the later coins of Byzantium (Sept. Severus &c.) male and female names occur in pairs. These are explained as the names of an *ἀρχιερεύς* and *ἀρχιερεία* and of a *βασίλεὺς* and *βασίλισσα*, functionaries of Byzantium.—J. W. Kubitschek. 'Ἐν Κοδρείῳις ὕποις Καλίκων.' An inscription found on coins of Sept. Severus struck at Tarsus.—F. Kenner. 'Goldmünzen der Sammlung Bachofen von Echt in Wien.' Medallion of Gallienus, &c.—F. Kenner. 'Silbermedaillon der Sammlung G. Weifert in Belgrad.' Medallion of Valentinian.—T. Rohde. 'Ein unedirte Antoninian des Kaisers Aurelianus aus der Münzstätte Siscia.'—B. Willner. 'Moderne Fälschungen römischer Münzen des Luigi Cigoi in Udine.' Gives a formidable list of 95 clever forgeries, chiefly of numismatic rarities of the later Roman emperors and empresses. Unfortunately, the paper is not accompanied by a photographic plate.—F. Quilling and H. Wehner. 'Das spezifische Gewicht als Echtheitskriterium römischer Messingmünzen.'

WARWICK WROTH.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Journal of Philology. Vol. xxiv. No. 48. 1896.

A contribution to the History of the Greek Anthology, Robinson Ellis. On two epigrams found on the reverse side of a page in MS. Bodl. Lat. class. d. 5, of cent. xv. The new *Soladei* discovered by Sayce and Mahaffy, Robinson Ellis. Corrects some lines in the first of some poems published by Prof. Sayce in vol. vii. of *Revue des Études Grecques* (1894). Horace, Odes, iv. 8, 15-20, J. Stanley. Defends these lines against Dr. Verrall, and takes *cjus* as a subjective genitive with *incendia*. Antigone II. 891-927, H. Macnaghten. Believes with Jebb and others that 904-912 are spurious, and considers that they are the work of Iophon who mistook *τοῖδ' ἀρνύμαι* (903) to refer to death whereas they refer to love. New Remarks on the Ibis of Ovid, Robinson Ellis. The 'Great Lacuna' in the Eighth Book of *Silius Italicus*, W. E. Heitland. Maintains the genuineness of ll. 144-223 which first appear in the Aldine edition (1523), on the evidence of Constantinus. Notes on Nonius, H. Nettleship. These are notes by the late Prof. Nettleship on the work of the late Mr. J. H. Onions whose material was published last year by Mr. W. M. Lindsay. 'The whole fragment,' says Mr. F. Haverfield, 'is printed rather as illustrating its author's ideas of an edition of Nonius than as containing his finished work in detail.' Notes on Empedocles, A. Platt. The person alluded to in Plat. Gorg. 493 A is certainly not Empedocles. Notes on Solon, A. Platt. We have a much better text of Solon in the *Ἀθην. Πολιτεία* than in Aristides. All of Solon given by Aristides is probably quoted from the *Ἀθ. Πολ.* Notes on Clement of Alexandria, H. Jackson. *Emendationes Homericae* (II. 1-xii.), T. L. Agar. The foll. are criticized, A 501 Δ 22, E 485, 554, H 452, Θ 213, K 530, Λ 757, M 116. On the sources of the Text of S. Athanasius, F. C. Conybeare. A collation of the Armenian version which is a most important aid towards the revision of the text. On the Composition of some Greek

Manuscripts, T. W. Allen. A description of the Ravenna Aristophanes. The text was written by one and the same scribe. 'This scribe was followed by two others, who dividing the MS. roughly between them, wrote scholia and glosses on the margins and between the lines of text; read the text, corrected, supplied, at their discretion, taking account also of the signals left for them by the first scribe.'

The American Journal of Philology. April 1896. Whole No. 65.

The Aryan God of Lightning, E. W. Fay. Substitutes lightning-myths for sun-myths, the lightning-cult having *a priori* a simpler origin than a sun-cult. On the Alleged Confusion of Nymph-Names, with especial reference to Propertius, i. 20 and ii. 32, 40, J. P. Postgate. Maintains that apart from passages obviously corrupt, the Greek and Latin literatures afford no evidence of any confusion in the use of the names of the different kinds of Nymphs: Dryads, Hamadryads, Naiads. In Prop. i. 20, 32 we should read *Enhydriasin*. Notes to the Dialogus de Oratoribus based on Gudemann's Edition, R. B. Steele. Considers some of the features of the vocabulary of the Dialogus. Yagna xlvi., L. H. Mills. Pliny and Magic, E. Riess. Finds a close resemblance between Pliny and the magical papyri discovered in Egypt. We may even use the Roman work to elucidate the sorcerers' recipes.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES. Brieger's *T. Lucreti Carv de rerum natura libri sex*. The new Teubner text. B's recension, like Munro's, is a continuation of the principles laid down by Lachmann. Lindsay's *The Saturnian Metre*. The merit lies in the method, but the solution has not yet been reached. Merrill's *Catullus*. The first complete Catullus edited by an American scholar, and a welcome addition to the 'College Series of Latin Authors.' In text the editor is, on the whole, conservative. Wissowa's *Pauly's Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, and Stolz's *His-*

torische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. In spite of incompleteness and want of proper arrangement the latter 'presents a collection of facts and references among which almost any one will be sure to find enough that is new to repay him for his trouble.'

Briefly mentioned are Macan's *Herodotus* iv.-vi. and Kaibels' *Galen's Protrepticus*.

Mnemosyne. N. S. Vol. 24. Part 3. 1896.

Observatiunculae de iure Romano, continued, J. C. Naber. Deals with *De censu librorum auctoritate* and *De finali controversia*. *Ad Corpus Inscriptionum Rhodiarum*, continued, H. van Gelder. *Infinitivi in -uri*, J. van der Vliet. Gives some examples from Apuleius. In Suet. de vir. illustr. (ed. Keiffersch.) p. 134, § 106* the word *plures* has fallen out after *scriberent*. *Ad Vitruvium*, v. 8, 1, K. Dumon. The phrase in *cornibus hemicyclii* is equivalent to *intra cornua hemicyclii*. *Templatur Cornelius Nepos in Attico* 10, 4, J. C. G. B. After *incideret* the words in *itinere* seem to have fallen out. *Studia Aristophanica*, H. van Herwerden. A number of emendations and interpretations. *Studia Lucretiana*, continued, J. Weltjer. On i. 526-537, 540-583, 871-874, 881-887, 998-1001, ii. 184-190, and 931-943. *Ad Aristophanis Ranas*, continued, J. van Leeuwen. Mostly with reference to Rutherford's ed. of the Scholia, of which he says 'multa inveni feliciter correcta, sagaciter suppleta, apte ordinata.'

Revue de Philologie. Vol. xx. Part 2. April 1896.

QV *dans liquidus, liquor, liquens, aqua*, L. Havet. Lucretius and Laevius treat *qu* as *tr* or *pl*, other poets treat it as *t* or *p*. In Aen. ix. 679 we should with Servius read *Liquetia* for *liquentia*. *Note sur deux inscriptions d'Athènes et de Priène*, P. Foucart. Two chronological notes. *Un nouveau sculpteur de Pergame*, K. D. Mylonas. The name of Menas of Pergamus appears as a sculptor from an inser. recently brought to Constantinople from Magnesia. *Notes sur la Poétique d'Aristote*. M. Dufour. *Plautus Amphitruo* 26, L. Havet. Would read *Comediam huius argumentum eloquor*. *Notes épigraphiques*, B. Haussoullier. *Corpus inser. Latin.* V. 1939 (concordia), L. Havet. Reads *Non fueras*,

non es, nescis, non pertinet ad te. *Les deux premiers Ptolémées et la confédération des Cyclades*, J. Delamarre. The complete publication and translation of an inser. discovered in 1893 on a small island near Amorgos. The date is at the beginning of the reign of Philadelphus and it is very valuable for the history of this confederation. *Notes sur quelques manuscrits de Patmos*, continued, J. Bidez and L. Parmentier. Deals with the text of Evagrius and Socrates.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Vol. 51. Part 3. 1896.

Die drei Brände des Tempels zu Delphi, H. Pomtow. The three burnings were 548-7 B.C., about 346 B.C. and 84 B.C. The old opinion that the temple built after the first burning lasted more than 700 years depends on the testimony of Pausanias. *Zu Ciceros Rede pro Flacco*, F. Schoell. Some elucidations and corrections to the earlier part which is fragmentary. *Die jetzige Gestalt der Grammatik des Charisius*, L. Jeep. As it is now known that Diomedes knew and used Charisius it becomes worth while to examine the grammatical treatise that has come down to us under the name of Charisius. *Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Dialogs Axiochos*, A. Brinkmann. *Das Wahlgesetz des Aristoteles*, E. Fabricius. The words of Plut. Arist. c. 22 *κοινὴν εἶναι τὴν πολιτείαν καὶ τοὺς ἀρχοντας ἐξ Ἀθηναίων πάντων αἰεῖσθαι* are not only not confirmed by 'Aθ. Πολ. but are inconsistent with it.

MISCELLAN. *Varia*, L. Radermacher. On some passages of Aelian. *Ueber Galens Schrift περί λεπτονοῦσης διαίτης*, K. Kalbfleisch. *Zu Catull und Petron*, Th. Birt. On Catull, 57, 6-10, which illustrates two passages in Petronius. *Petronius und Lucianus*, O. Hirschfeld. A passage in c. 20 of *πῶς δεῖ ἰστροπὴν συγγράφειν* evidently refers to Petronius. *Ad Petroni saturas* (53), J. Gilbert. Suggests *reliqua enim talia acroamata for reliqua animalia acr.* *Tessera hospitalis*, M. Ihm. Rams' heads in bronze with inser. were used for *tesserae* perhaps because the ram was the animal by whose sacrifice the agreement was confirmed. *Das Consulatsjahr des Tacitus*, O. Hirschfeld. The old opinion that the year was 97 A.D. is correct. *Die Tyrier in dem zweiten Römisch-Karthagischen Vertrag*, O. Hirschfeld. For *Τυρίων* in Polyb. iii. 24 H. would read *κυρίων* or else consider that Polyb. has made a mistake.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN BOOKS.

Apollonius of Perga. *Treatise on Conic Sections*. Edited in modern notation, with introduction by T. L. Heath. 8vo. 424 pp. Cambridge Univ. Press. 15s.

Aristophanes. The *Plutus*, with notes in Greek based on the Scholia, ed. by Frank W. Nicholson. Square 12mo. iv, 123 pp. Boston, Ginn. 90 cts.

—Ranae, ed. F. G. Plaistowe. Introduction, Text, Notes. Crown 8vo. Clive. (Univ. Tutorial Series.) 3s. 6d.

—Ranae. Translation. Test papers. Crown 8vo. Clive. (Univ. Tutorial Series.) 2s. 6d.

—The Birds, in English rhyme, translated by J. S. Rogers. 12mo. Houlston. 1s. 6d. net.

Aristoteles. Carroll (M.) Aristotle's [Poetics]. C. XXV, in the Light of the Homeric Scholia. Baltimore. 8vo. 66 pp.

Benecke (E. F. M.) Antimachus of Colophon and the position of women in Greek poetry. Crown 8vo. 264 pp. Sonnenschein. 6s.

Broughton (Mrs. V. D.) Handbook to the Antiquities of Athens. Illustrated by S. C. Arbuthnot and L. Nicole. Crown 8vo. 120 pp. Simpkin. 5s.

Burnet (J.) Greek Rudiments. Crown 8vo. 388 pp. Longmans. 5s.

Chicago Studies in Classical Philology. Ed. by a committee representing the departments of Greek, Latin, Archaeology, and Comparative Philology. Vol. I. 8vo. 249 pp. Chicago.

- Coleridge* (E. P.) *Res Romanae*: aids to history, geography, literature, etc. of ancient Rome. Crown 8vo. 166 pp. Bell. 2s. 6d.
- Euripides*. The Tragedies. In English verse, by A. S. Way. (3 vols.) Vol. II. Crown 8vo. 470 pp. Macmillan. 6s. net.
- Farnell* (L. R.) The Cults of the Greek States. (In 3 vols.) Vols. I., II. 8vo. 786 pp. Frowde. £1 12s. net.
- Homer*. Opera et reliquiae rec. D. B. Monro. Crown 8vo. 1040 pp. Frowde. 10s. 6d. net.
- The Odyssey, done into English verse. Crown 8vo. 458 pp. Longmans. 6s.
- Mahaffy* (J. P.) A survey of Greek civilization. Crown 8vo. 337 pp. Meadville, Pa. \$1.
- Plautus*. The Pseudolus, edited with introduction by H. W. Anden. 12mo. 180 pp. Cambridge Univ. Press. 3s.
- Ritchie* (F.) Easy Greek grammar papers. 12mo. 114 pp. Longmans. 1s. 6d.
- Robertson* (G. S.) *Utrum Aristophanes an Thucydides veriora de vita ac moribus Atheniensium praeceperit, Oratio Latina*. Chancellor's Prize Essay, 1896. 8vo. 34 pp. Simpkin. 1s. 6d.
- Sandys* (J. E.) First Greek Reader and Writer. With Greek and English vocabularies. Royal 16mo. 235 pp. Sonnenschein. 2s. 6d.
- Suetonius*. Divus Augustus, edited, with historical introduction, by E. S. Shuckburgh. 8vo. 216 pp. Cambridge Univ. Press. 10s.
- Tacitus*. The Annals, edited with introduction and notes by H. Furneaux. Vol. I. (Book 1—6.) Second Edition. 8vo. 670 pp. Frowde. 18s.
- Tarbell* (F. B.) History of Greek Art. Crown 8vo. 295 pp. Meadville, Pa. \$1.
- Terentius*. Adelphi, edited by W. F. Masom. Crown 8vo. Clive. (Univ. Tutorial Series.) 3s. 6d.
- Virgil*. Morris (Will.) The Eneids of Virgil, done into English verse. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 382 pp. Longmans. 6s.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Aeschylus*. Orestie, griechisch und deutsch von U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. Part II. Das Opfer am Grabe. 8vo. 268 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 7 Mk.
- Aristophanes*. Steurer (H.) De Aristophanis carminibus lyricis. 8vo. 54 pp. Strassburg. 1 Mk. 20.
- Aristoteles*. Bericht über Aristoteles und die ältesten Akademiker und Peripatetiker, für 1894, von F. Susemihl. 8vo. 48 pp. Berlin, Calvary. 1 Mk. 80.
- (Aus 'Jahresbericht über die Fortschr. der class. Altertumsw.') — Bericht über die in den Jahren 1892—1895 erschienene Literatur zu Aristoteles' *Ἀθροίσματα ποικίλα*. Von V. von Schoeffer. 8vo. 84 pp. Berlin, Calvary. 3 Mk. 60.
- (Aus 'Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.') — Gomperz (Th.) Zu Aristoteles Poetik. III. 8vo. 45 pp. Wien, Gerold. 1 Mk. 10.
- (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte d. R. K. Akad. d. Wissensch.') — *Asbach* (Jul.) Römisches Kaisertum und Verfassung bis auf Traian. Eine historische Einleitung zu den Schriften des Tacitus. 8vo. ix, 192 pp. Köln, Dumont-Schauberg. 4 Mk. 40.
- Blemmidae* (Nicephori) curriculum vitae et carmina, ed. Aug. Heisenberg. 8vo. cx, 136 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 4 Mk.
- Caesar*. Frölich (K.) Adverbialsätze in Caesars b. Gall. V.—VII. Part II. 4to. 20 pp. Berlin.
- May (O.) Caesar als Beurtheiler seines Heeres in den Commentarien vom gallischen Kriege. 8vo. 42 pp. Neisse. 50 Pf.
- (Aus 'Bericht der Gesellschaft Philomathie.') — Callimachi Aetiorum librum I. prolegomenis, testimoniis, adnotatione critica, auctoribus, imitatoribus instr. E. Dittich. 8vo. 55 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk.
- (Aus 'Jahrbücher für class. Philologie,' Suppl. Vol. 23.) — Catalogue des bronzes trouvés sur l'Acropole d'Athènes, publié par A. de Ridder. Part II. 8vo. 239—362 pp. 130 engravings, 8 plates. Paris.
- (Fasc. 74 of the 'Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes' et de Rome.) — *Catullus*. Fenner (L.) Quaestiones Catullianae. 8vo. 55 pp. Barmen.
- Cicero*. Bericht über die Litteratur zu Ciceros rhetorischen Schriften. (1881—1893.) Von E. Ströbel. Vol. II. 8vo. 53 pp. Berlin, Calvary. 1 Mk. 80.
- (Aus 'Jahresber. über d. F. d. class. Altertumsw.') — Gassner (J.) Ciceronis librorum de natura deorum argumentum explicatum. 8vo. 16 pp. Salzburg. 60 Pf.
- Cichorius* (Conr.) Die Reliefs der Trajanssäule, historisch erklärt. Vol. I. Plates. (57 plates in portfolio.) Vol. II. Commentary. (vi, 372 pp., engravings, map.) 8vo. Berlin, Reimer. 54 Mk.
- Collignon* (M.) Geschichte der griechischen Plastik, übersetzt mit Anmerkungen von E. Thraemer. Pt. 4. 8vo. 361—480 pp. Strassburg, Trübner. 4 Mk.
- Conze* (A.) Jahresbericht über die Thätigkeit des Kaiserlich Deutschen archaeologischen Instituts. 8vo. 9 pp. Berlin, 1896.
- Cornelius Nepos*. De la Chaux (G.) Der Gebrauch der Verba und ihrer Ableitungen bei Nepos. Teil I. 4to. 22 pp. Gumbinnen.
- Corpus inscriptionum et societate literaria regia Lipsiensis pecuniis adjectum administrante A. Danielsson ed. C. Pauli*. Segmentum V. et VI. fol. 225—394 pp. Leipzig, Barth. Each part 20 Mk.
- Curtius* (Ernst.) Kekule von Stradonitz (R.) Ernst Curtius, Gedächtnissrede. 8vo. 23 pp. Berlin, Spemann. 50 Pf.
- Demosthenes*. Sept philippiques. Texte grec, accompagné d'une vie de D. de notices et analyses, de notes, etc. par H. Weil. 12mo. xlv, 243 pp. Paris. 1 Fr. 50.
- Doege* (H.) Quae ratio intercedat inter Panaetium et Antiochum Ascalonitam in morali philosophia. 8vo. 56 pp. Halle.
- Euclidis opera omnia*. Edid. I. L. Heiberg et H. Menge. Vol. VI. Data cum commentario Marini et scholiis antiquis. Ed. H. Menge. 8vo. lxii, 336 pp., engravings. Leipzig, Teubner. 5 Mk.

- Euripides.* Schultze (O.) *Disquisitiones Euripideae ad recensioem posterioris ordinis fabularum pertinentes.* 8vo. iv, 32 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk.
- Flori (L. Annaei) *epitomae libri II. et P. Annii Flori fragmentum de Vergilio oratore an poeta.* Ed. O. Rossbach. 8vo. lviii, 272 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 80.
- Frey (J.) *Die Thätigkeit Münsterischer Humanisten auf dem Gebiete der lateinischen Syntax.* 4to. 17 pp. Münster.
- Galenii *institutio logica*, ed. Car. Kalbfleisch. xii, 75 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 26.
- Geffken (Jo.) *Leonidas von Tarent.* 8vo. 164 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 5 Mk. 60.
(Aus 'Jahrb. f. class. Philologie,' Suppl. Vol. 23.)
- Grabreliefs (Die attischen), herausgegeben von Al. Conze. Part VIII. Imper. folio. Pp. 195-218, engravings, 25 plates. In Portfolio. Berlin, Spemann. 60 Mk.
- Guhrauer (H.) *Antigone und Ismene. Eine Studie.* 4to. 13 pp. Wittenberg.
- Hahne (F.) *Zur sprachlichen Aesthetik der Griechen: Die Lehre von den Stilarten.* 4to. 38 pp. Braunschweig.
- Hamelbeck. *Der ionicus a maiore mit aufgelöster erster Länge in den lyrischen und chorischen Dichtungen der Griechen.* 4to. 35 pp. Mülheim a. Rh. 1 Mk. 50.
- Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft von Iwan von Müller. Vol. VIII. Part III. *Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis Justinian von M. Schanz.* Vol. III. (Von Hadrian bis Constantin.) 8vo. xix, 410 pp. München. Beck. 7 Mk. 50.
- Harnack (A.) *Die pseudojustinische 'Rede an die Griechen.'* 8vo. 20 pp. Berlin.
- Herodotus. Nikel (J.) *Herodot und die Keilschriftforschung.* Paderborn, Schöningh. 2 Mk.
(Aus '28. Bericht der Philomathie zu Neisse.')
- Hirschfeld (O.) *Aquitani in der Römerzeit.* 8vo. 28 pp. Berlin.
- Homeri *Iliadis carmina, cum apparatu critico* ediderunt J. van Leeuwen et M. B. Mendes da Costa. Ed. II. Part II. 8vo. Pp. 335-696. Leiden, Siijthoff. 3 Mk.
- Homerus.* Grumme (A.) *Die wichtigeren Besonderheiten der homerischen Syntax.* 8vo. 11 pp. Gera.
- Kornke. *Ueber den Eingang des neunten Gesanges der Ilias.* 4to. 14 pp. Glatz.
- Ludwig (A.) *Homérica (VIII.—XII.).* 4to. 32 pp. Königsberg. 50 Pf.
- Streinz (F.) *De Nectia Homérica.* 8vo. 21 pp. Klagenfurt, Kleinmayr. 1 Mk.
- Tolkiehn (J.) *De Homeri auctoritate in cotidiana Romanorum vita.* 8vo. 69 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 60.
(Aus 'Jahrbücher f. class. Philol. Suppl. Vol. 23.')
- Horatius Flaccus* (Q.) *Gedichte*, herausgegeben von G. Schimmelpfeng. Text. 8vo. iii, 315 pp., portr. and 2 maps. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk.
- Cornelius (C.) *De Horatii satirarum libri prima satira decima commentariolum. Accedunt aliquot odae germanice versae.* 4to. 32 pp. Dillenburg.
- Saragat (Gian Mart) *Ugo Foscolo e Q. Orazio Flacco, studio critico, con documenti storici tratti dai fonti più accertata intorno al poeta latino.* 16mo. 117 pp. Milan, Hoepli. 1 Lire 50.
- Sellin. *Das sabinische Landgut des Horaz.* 4to. 19 pp., 1 map, 1 plate. Schwerin.
- Simon (J. A.) *Zur Anordnung der Oden des Horaz.* II. 4to. 16 pp.
- Hylan (J. E.) *De Tantalo.* 8vo. 129 pp. Upsala.
- Ilberg (J.) *Die Sphinx in der griechischen Kunst und Sage.* 4to. 48 pp. Leipzig.
- Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, herausgegeben von A. Fleckeisen. Suppl. Vol. XXIII. Part I. 8vo. 289 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 Mk.
- Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, herausgegeben von. Iw. von Müller. Vol. 87. (Supplement of 3rd Series.) Parts II. and III. (Deecke, italische Sprachen 1886—1893. Larfeld (W.) *Griechische Epigraphik.*) 8vo. Pp. 97-288. Berlin, Calvary. 3 Mk. 60.
- Jahresbericht über die christlich-lateinische Literatur von 1886—1894*, von C. Weymann. 8vo. 64 pp. Berlin, Calvary. 6 Mk.
(Aus 'Jahresbericht über d. F. d. class. Altertumsw.')
- Jahresbericht über die Mythologie aus den Jahren 1891 und 1892*, von O. Gruppe. 8vo. 219 pp. Berlin, Calvary. 6 Mk.
(Aus 'Jahresber. über d. F. d. class. Altertumsw.')
- Kiepert (H.) und Ch. Huelsen, *formae urbis Romae antiquae.* 1: 10000. 2 sheets at 55.5 × 65 ctm. 1 sheet at 44 × 61 ctm. (Coloured.) *Accedit nomenclator topographicus a Ch. Huelsen composuit.* Royal 8vo. xii, 110 pp. Cloth. Berlin, D. Reimer. 12 Mk.
- Klassiker-Ausgaben der griechischen Philosophie.* Vol. I. Sokrates. *Eine Sammlung apologetischer Schriften Xenophons und Platons*, herausgegeben von K. Lincke. 8vo. xv, 159 pp. Halle, Waisenhaus. 1 Mk. 20.
- Knoke (F.) *Das Varuslager im Habichtswalde bei Stift Leeden.* 4to. 20 pp. 2 plates. Berlin, Gärtner. 4 Mk.
- Kobyłanski (J.) *De enuntiatorum consecutorum apud tragicos Graecos usu ac ratione disputatio.* 8vo. 56 pp. Kolomea.
- Kohl (O.) *Griechischer Unterricht.* 8vo. 64 pp. Langensalza. 1 Mk. 50.
(Aus 'Encyclopädi. Handbuch der Pädagogik.')
- Lanciani (Rud.) *Forma urbis Romae, consilio et auctoritate regiae academiae Lynceorum formam dimensus est et ad modulum 1: 1000 delineavit.* Fasc. IV. 6 sheets at 57.4-87 ctm. (Coloured.) Milan, Hoepli. 20 Mk.
- Lattmann (H.) *De coniunctivo Latino.* 8vo. 48 pp. Nordhausen. 1 Mk.
- Limes (Der obergermanisch-raetische) des Roemerreiches. Im Auftrag der Reichs-Limes-Commission herausgegeben von O. von Sarwey und F. Hettner. Part III. 4to. 22, 15 pages, engravings, 5 plates, 1 map. Heidelberg, Petters. 2 Mk. 80.
- Livius. Winkler (L.) *Der Infinitiv bei Livius in den Büchern I., XXI. und XLV.* 8vo. 24 pp. Brück.
- Longus. *Daphnis et Chloé, traduction d'Amyot, revue par P. L. Courier.* Illustrations par Paul Leroy. 16mo. 207 pp. Paris, Lemerre. 2 Frs.
- Lucretius. Hidén (C. T.) *De casuum syntaxi Lucretiana I.* 8vo. xi, 122 pp. Helsingfors. 2 Mk.
- Lyons (H. G.) u. L. Borchardt. *Eine trilingue Inschrift von Philae.* 8vo. 14 pp., 1 plate. Berlin.
- Mancini (A.) *Il dramma satirico Greco.* 8vo. vi, 107 pp. Pisa.
- Masson (P.) *De Massiliensium negotiationibus ab urbe Massilia condita usque ad tempus quo Christiani Terram Sanctam armis subegerunt.* 8vo. vii, 145 pp. Marseille.
- Meyer (Geo.) *Wann hat Kleon den thrakischen Feldzug begonnen.* 8vo. 15 pp. Nordhausen. 60 Pf.
(Aus 'Festschrift der Klosterschule Ilfeld.')

- Meyer* (W.) *Pitra Mone und die byzantinische Strophik*. 8vo. 18 pp. München.
- Milchhofer* (A.) *Das archäologische Sculpturen-Museum der Kieler Universität*. 8vo. 16 pp., 1 map. Kiel.
- Monumenta Germaniae historica*. (New Quarto Edition.) *Auctorum antiquissimorum* tomus XIII. pars 3. (*Chronica minora saec IV., V., VI., VII.* ed. Th. Mommsen. Fasc. 3.) 4to. Pp. 355-469. Berlin, Weidmann. 5 Mk. on writing paper 8 Mk.
- Nordmeyer* (G.) *Der Tod Neros in der Legende*. 4to. 10 pp. Mors.
- Ovidius*. Gilbert (J.) *Ovidianae quaestiones criticae et exegeticae*. 4to. 24 pp. Meissen.
- Pacianus*. Peyrot (P. H.) *Paciani Barcelonensis episcopi opuscula edita et illustrata*. 8vo. xi, 142 pp. Utrecht.
- Pascal* (Car.) *Studi di antichità e mitologia*. 8vo. 241 pp. Milan, Hoepli. 6 Lire 50.
- Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio*, ed., emend., apparatus criticum adiecit H. Hitzig, commentarium germanice scriptum cum XI. tabulis topogr. et numism. addiderant H. Hitzig et H. Bluemner. Vol. I. pars I. Liber I.: Attica. 8vo. xxiv, 379 pp. Berlin, Calvary. 18 Mk.
- Persius*. Küster (H.) *De A. Persii Flacci elocutione quaestiones*. II. 8vo. 24 pp. Löbau.
- Pesch* (W.) *Einige Bemerkungen über das Wesen und die Arten der dramatischen Poesie (angeknüpft an die Poetik des Aristoteles)*. (Continued.) 4to. 17 pp. Trier.
- Phaedrus* (und *Avianus*). Bericht über die Literatur zu Phaedrus und Avianus für die Jahre 1892-94, von H. Draheim. 8vo. 24 pp. Berlin, Calvary. 1 Mk. 20.
(Aus 'Jahresbericht über d. F. d. class. Altertumschw.')
- Philodamos*. Diels (H.) *Zum delphischen Paian des Philodamos*. 8vo. 5 pp. Berlin.
- Philonis Alexandrini Opera quae supersunt*, edd. L. Cohn et P. Wendland. Vol. I. Cum tabula phototypica codicis Vindobonensis. 8vo. cxiv, 298 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 9 Mk.
- Pindari carmina, prolegomenis et commentariis instructa*, ed. W. Christ. 8vo. cxxvii, 466 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 14 Mk.
- Plato*. Hartman (J. L. V.) *Notae criticae ad Platonis de republica libros*. Part I. (libr. I.-V.) 8vo. xvi, 159 pp. Haag, Nijhoff. 4 Mk. 25.
- Horneffer (E.) *De Hippia Maiore qui fertur Platonis*. 8vo. 70 pp. Göttingen.
- Karlowa. *Zu Plato's Protagoras*. 4to. 17 pp. Pless.
- Riek (H.) *Neue Untersuchungen über den Platonischen Theätet*. (Continued.) 4to. 18 pp. Kempen.
- Plauti comediae, rec. et emend.* Frd. Leo. Vol. II. Miles. Mostellaria. Persa. Poenulus. Pseudolus. Rudens. Stichus. Trinummus. Truculentus. Vidularia. Fragmenta. 8vo. iv, 574 pp. Berlin Weidmann. 20 Mk.
- Plautus*. Leo (F.) *Analecta Plantina. De figuris sermonis*. I. 8vo. 48 pp. Göttingen, Dieterich. 50 Pf.
- Roosen (A.) *De quarundam verbi et adjectivi formarum usu Plautino Annaeano*. 4to. 32 pp. Bonn.
- Plutschette* (D.) *Der rätisch-obergermanische Limes nach den neueren Forschungen*. 4to. 76 pp., 1 map. Diekirch.
- Plinius*. Keese (J.) *Quomodo Serenus Sammonicus a medicina Pliniana ipsoque Plinio pendeat*. 8vo. 67 pp. Rostock.
- Plutarchus*. Siefert (G.) *De aliquot Plutarchi scriptorum moralium compositione atque indole*. 8vo. 132 pp. Zena.
- Pompeius Trogus*. Neuhaus (O.) *Die Quellen des Pompejus Trogus in der persischen Geschichte*. V. 4to. 36 pp. Königsberg.
- Procopius Caesarensis*. *La guerra gotica. Testo greco emendato, con traduzione italiana a cura di Domen. Comparesetti*. Vol. II. 8vo. 468 pp. Roma. 12 lire.
- Reber* (F. von). *Ueber das Verhältniss des mykenischen zum dorischen Baustil*. 4to. 55 pp., engravings, 2 plates. München. 2 Mk. 20.
(Aus 'Abhandlungen der k. bayr. Akademie der Wissenschaften.')
- Rilievi* (J.) *delle urne etruschi*. Vol. II., Part II. *Publicata a nome dell' imperiale istituto archaeologico germanico da Gust. Koerte*. 4to. Pp. 141-266 and plates 57-109. Roma. 40 Mk.
- Rost* (J.) *Uebersetzungsproben aus griechischen und römischen Dichtern*. 4to. 32 pp. Schweidnitz.
- Sallustius*. Jugurtha, expliqué littéralement, traduit et annoté par Croiset. 12mo. 403 pp. Paris, Hachette. 3 Fr. 50.
- Sammlung der griechischen Dialektinschriften herausgegeben von Dr. H. Collitz*. Vol. II., part 5. *Die delphischen Inschriften, bearbeitet von Jo. Baunack*. 8vo. Pp. 441-642. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck. 6 Mk.
- Schwarz* (J.) *Neun Briefe an Prof. Nerrlich über die Literatur der Griechen*. 8vo. 41 pp. Leipzig, Hirschfeld. 1 Mk.
- Schwaab* (L.) *Die kaiserlichen Decennlien und die alexandrinischen Münzen*. 4to. 54 pp., 32 engravings. Tübingen.
- Seidenstuecker* (E.) *De Xantho Lydo rerum scriptore quaestiones selectae*. 8vo. 64 pp. Kiel.
- Senecae* (L. Annaei) *ad Lucilium epistolae morales* 1-16. Avec des notes en français par R. Aubé. 16 mo. 80 pp. Paris, Hachette. 75 cts.
- Seneca*. Hermes (E.) *Kritische Bemerkungen zu den Schriften des Philosophen L. Annaeus Seneca*. 4to. 5 pp. Mors.
- Sophocles*. Hooykaas (J.) *De Sophoclis Oedipode Colone*. 8vo. 104 pp. Leiden.
- Otte (H.) *Wiederholungen bei Sophokles*. 4to. 26 pp. Berlin.
- Status*. Klotz (Alfr.) *Curae Stadianae*. 8vo. 80 pp. Leipzig. 1 Mk. 20.
- Stein* (Frd.) *Die Völkerstämme der Germanen nach römischer Darstellung. Ein Commentar zu Plinius, Natur. hist. iv, 28 und Tacitus Germania c. 2*. 8vo. vii, 103 pp. Schweinfurt. 1 Mk. 80.
- Studien* (Berliner) für classische Philologie und Archaeologie. Vol. XVI. Part 3. (De Granii Liciniani fontibus et auctoritate, scripsit O. Dieckmann.) 8vo. 94 pp. Berlin, Calvary. 3 Mk.
- Suetonii Vita Divi Claudii, commentario instr.* H. Smilda. 8vo. vii, 192 pp. Groningen, Wolters. 4 Mk. 20.
- Suetonius*. Hahn (R.) *Zur Religionsgeschichte des zweiten Jahrhunderts: Die Religion des C. Suetonius Tranquillus*. 4to. 19 pp. Breslau.
- Sundermeier* (A.) *Quaestiones chronographicae ad Eusebi et Hieronymi chronica spectantes*. 8vo. 44 pp. Kiel.
- Tacitus*. Jahresbericht über Tacitus. 1892-1895. Von G. Helmreich. 8vo. 62 pp. Berlin, Calvary. 2 Mk. 40.
(Aus 'Jahresb. üb. d. F. d. class. Altertumschw.')
- Vianey (F.) *Quomodo dici possit Tacitum summum pingendi artificem*. 8vo. 101 pp. Paris, Hachette.